



# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

आधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 27]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 4, 1987/आषाढ़ 13 1909

No. 27]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 4, 1987/ASADHA 13, 1909

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में  
रखा जा सके  
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as  
a separate compilation

## भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं  
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than  
the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक , लोक कल्याण तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय  
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 जून, 1987

का. प्रा. 1663.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री जी. सीताराम मुत्ति, अधिवक्ता हैदराबाद को श्री एम. गोपालकृष्णा, महाप्रबन्धक, आंध्र बैंक हैदराबाद और अन्य के विरुद्ध दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन आर. सी. 1/85 की धारा 1, यू. I के अभियोग का संचालन करने के लिए प्रधान उप महाप्रबन्धक, हैदराबाद के न्यायालय में विशेष लोक अभियोग के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 225/3/87 ए. वी. डी-II]

के. आर. गोपाल राव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES  
AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel & Training)

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1987

S.O. 1663.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the code of Criminal Procedure,

1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. Sitharamamurthi, Advocate, Hyderabad, as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting prosecution of the Delhi Special Police Establishment RC 1/85-CIU. I against Shri M. Gopalakrishnaiah, General Manager, Andhra Bank, Hyderabad and others, in the Court of the Principal Sub-Judge, Hyderabad.

[No. 225/3/87-AVD.II]

K. R. GOPAL RAO, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 1987

(आयकर)

का. प्रा. 1664 —आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उप खंड (iii) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व विभाग) में दिनांक 18-11-1983 को जारी की गई अधिसूचना सं. 5466 [का. सं. 398/1/83 का. क. (ब)], जिसमें श्री टी. एन. छाबडिया को कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया था, को एतद्वारा दिनांक 6-4-1987 से रद्द किया जाता है।

[सं. 7253 (का. सं. 398/11/87-मा. क. (ब))]

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1987

## INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1664.—The notification issued in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) No. 5466 [F. No. 398/1/83-IT(B)] dated the 18th November, 1983, in pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of Clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) appointing Shri T. N. Chhabaria as Tax Recovery Officer is hereby cancelled w.e.f. 6th April, 1987.

[No. 7253 (F. No. 398/11/87-IT(B))]

नई दिल्ली, 30 अप्रैल, 1987

का. आ. 1665.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उप-खण्ड (ii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 8-8-1985 की अधिसूचना संख्या 6367 [फा. सं. 398/7/85 आ. क. (ब)] का अधिलेखन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी श्री एम. एल. उप्पल को कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री एम. एल. उप्पल द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं. 7263 (फा. सं. 398/13/87-आ. क. (ब))]

New Delhi, the 30th April, 1987

S.O. 1665.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 6367 [F. No. 398/7/85-IT(B)] dated the 8th August, 1985, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri M. L. Uppal being a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri M. L. Uppal takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 7263 (F. No. 398/13/87-IT(B))]

नई दिल्ली, 5 मई, 1987

का. आ. 1666.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार, राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 11-3-87 की अधिसूचना सं. 7179 [फा. सं. 398/26/86 आ. क. (ब)] का अधिलेखन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी श्री सोबनाथ सिंह को कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री सोबनाथ सिंह द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख 22-8-1986 से लागू होगी।

[सं. 7268 (फा. सं. 398/26/86 आ. क. (ब))]

श्री ई. अलेक्जेंडर, अध्वर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th May, 1987

S.O. 1666.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 7179 (F. No. 398/26/86-IT(B)) dated the 11th March, 1987, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Sob Nath Singh being a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from 22nd August, 1986 the date on which Shri Sob Nath Singh took over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 7268 (F. No. 398/6/86-IT (B))]

B. E. ALEXANDER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 10 जून, 1987

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1667.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 193 के परन्तुक खण्ड (ii ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त खण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ नेशनल थर्मल पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लि., नई दिल्ली द्वारा जारी किए गए "14 प्रतिशत आरक्षित विमोच्य एन टी. पी. सी. बन्धपत्र 1986—द्वितीय श्रृंखला" को विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

बशर्ते कि पृष्ठांकन अथवा वितरण द्वारा इस प्रकार के बन्धपत्रों के प्रन्तरण के मामले में लाभ स्वीकार्य होगा यदि अन्तरिमो द्वारा प्रकार के प्रन्तरण से 60 दिन की अवधि के अन्दर रजिस्टर्ड डाक द्वारा उक्त कॉर्पोरेशन को सूचित करें।

[सं. 7345/फ. सं. 275/4/87-आ. क. (ब)]

श्री. नागराजन्, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 10th June, 1987

## INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1667.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iib) of the proviso to section 193 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby specifies the "14 per cent Secured Redeemable NTPC Bonds-1986-Second Series" issued by the National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd., New Delhi, for the purposes of the said clause :

Provided that the benefit under the said proviso shall be admissible in the case of transfer of such bonds by endorsement or delivery, if the transferee informs the said Corporation by registered post within a period of sixty days of such transfer.

[No. 7345/F. No. 275/4/87-IT(B)]

B. NAGARAJAN Director

## कीन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 2 मार्च, 1987

का. आ. 1668.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 क की उपधारा (1) तथा समय समय पर यथासंशोधित दिनांक 12-2-1985 की अधिसूचना सं. 6154 (फा. सं. 261/5/84 आ. क. (ग्या.)) तथा दिनांक 30-8-1985 की अधिसूचना सं. 640 (फा. सं. 261/12/85 आ. क. (ग्या.)) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निवेदन देता है कि आयकर आयुक्त (ग्रपील I, II, V तथा XV कलकत्ता, स्तम्भ (2) तथा स्तम्भ (3) की तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर धाड़ों परिमण्डलों, जिनमें और रेजों में आयकर अथवा अतिकर या ब्याजकर से निर्धारित ऐसे व्यक्तियों के बारे में ऐसे कार्य निर्वहन करेंगे, जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) में (ज) कम्पनी (लाभ) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) तथा ब्याजकर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (i) में उल्लिखित किसी भी धादेश से व्यक्ति हुए हैं और ऐसे व्यक्तियों को बाँधत भी कार्य निर्वहन करेंगे जिनके लिए बोर्ड ने आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा

246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार निवेश दिया हुआ था भविष्य में निवेश दें।

अधिकार क्षेत्र तथा प्रधान कार्यालय	आयकर-वार्ड तथा परिमण्डल	नि. सं. प्रा. की रेंज
1	2	3
1. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) -I कलकत्ता।	1. कम्पनी जिला-II (क से छ वार्ड)	1. नि. सं. प्रा. रेंज VII
2. आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील) -II, कलकत्ता।	कम्पनी जिला-VI (क से छ वार्ड)	1. नि. सं. प्रा. रेंज -II 2. नि. सं. प्रा. विशेष कर-निर्धारण रेंज-I 3. नि. सं. प्रा. क. नि. रेंज-II 4. नि. सं. प्रा. क. नि. रेंज XII
3. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) V कलकत्ता।	1. विशेष परिमण्डल-IX कलकत्ता	नि. सं. प्रा. विशेष रेंज, IX, कलकत्ता
4. आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील) XV	1. विशेष जाच परि. -III 2. विदेश कम्पनी परि. I	1. नि. सं. प्रा., विशेष जाच रेंज-III

2	3
2. विदेश कम्पनी परि. II	2. नि. सं. प्रा. विदेश कम्पनी, रेंज -I
3. विदेश कम्पनी परि. II	3. नि. सं. प्रा. विदेश कम्पनी रेंज-II
4. जिला IX	4. नि. सं. प्रा., रेंज -XXX

जहाँ कोई आयकर परिमण्डल, वार्ड अथवा जिला अथवा रेंज या उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक अधिकार-क्षेत्र से किसी अन्य अधिकार क्षेत्र में अन्तर्गत कर दिया गया हो, वहाँ उस आयकर वार्ड परिमण्डल अथवा जिला अथवा रेंज या उसके किसी भाग में किए गए कर निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से तत्काल पूर्व, अधिकार क्षेत्र के उस आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) के समक्ष बिना राशीन पड़ी अपील जिसके अधिकार-क्षेत्र में वह आयकर परिमण्डल, जिला वार्ड अथवा रेंज या उसका कोई भाग अन्तर्गत किया गया हो, या अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से अधिकार-क्षेत्र के उस आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) को अन्तर्गत की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा निपटाई जाएगी, जिसके अधिकार-क्षेत्र में उक्त वार्ड, परिमण्डल अथवा जिला अथवा रेंज या उसका कोई भाग अन्तर्गत किया गया हो।

यह अधिसूचना 2-3-87 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 7155 (फा. सं. 261/2/87 प्रा. क. म्या)]

सुरेन्द्र पाल, अवर सचिव

### CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 2nd March, 1987

S. O. 1668 :—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in modification No. 6154 (F. No. 261/5/84-ITJ) dated 12.2.1985 and No. 6400 (F. No. 261/12/85-ITJ) dt. 30-8-85 as amended from time to time, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-I, II, V and XV, Calcutta, shall perform such functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Sur-tax or Interest Tax in the Income-tax, Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in Column 2 and Column 3 thereof as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in Clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, in sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the Companies (Profit) sur-tax, Act, 1964 (7 of 1964) and in sub-section (1) of Section 15 of the Interest-tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with provisions of Clause (1) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

Charges with Head Quarters	Income-Tax wards and Circles	Range of IAC
1	2	3
1. Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-I, Calcutta.	1. Comp. Dist.-II (A to G Wards)	1. IAC, Range-VII
2. Commissioner of Income-tax, (Appeals)-II Calcutta.	1. Comp. Dist.-III (A to G Wards)	1. IAC, Range-II 2. IAC, Spl. Asstt. Range-I. 3. IAC, Asstt. R-II. 4. IAC, Asstt. R-XII.
3. Commissioner of Income-tax, (Appeals)-V, Calcutta.	1. Special Circle-IX, Calcutta.	1. IAC, Spl. R-IX, Calcutta.
4. Commissioner of Income-tax, (Appeals)XV, Calcutta.	1. Spl. Inv. Cir.-III 2. Foreign Comp. Circle-I 3. Foreign Comp. Circle-II. 4. District-IX.	1. IAC., Spl. Inv. Range-III. 2. IAC, Foreign Comp., Range-I. 3. IAC, Foreign Comp. Range-II. 4. IAC, Range-XXX.

Whereas an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or Range of part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one charge to another charge, appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Income-tax Ward, Circle or District or Range or Part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before CIT(A) of the charge from which that Income-tax Circle, District, Ward or Range or Part thereof is transferred shall, from the date of this notification takes effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) of the charge to whom the said Ward, Circle or District or Range or Part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 2-3-1987.

[No. 7155/F. No. 261/2/87-ITJ]  
SURENDER PAUL, Under Secy.

मई विल्ली, 24 जून, 1987

आदेश

धन-कर

का. आ. 1669.—दिनांक 8 जून, 1973 के आदेश सं. 19 (फा सं. 328/118/72 घ.क.) तथा दिनांक 15-2-75 के आदेश सं. 12/75 (फा. सं. 328/22/75 घ.क.) के आदेशिक संशोधन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड निदेश देता है कि उपर्युक्त आदेशों से संलग्न सारणी में क्रम सं. 66 तथा क्रम सं. 77 के सामने दी गई प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएँ:—

सारणी

क्रम संख्या	अधिकारी का पदनाम	क्षेत्र
1	2	3
66	मूल्यांकन अधिकारी/सहायक मूल्यांकन अधिकारी (अचल-सम्पत्ति) नागपुर।	मद्रस, नागपुर, नविघ, योत्मल, धकोला, अमरावती, चांदा ओरंगाबाद, जालना परभनी, बघी, अस्मानाबाद तथा बुलढाना के जिले
77	मूल्यांकन अधिकारी/सहायक मूल्यांकन अधिकारी (अचल सम्पत्ति) सोलापुर।	शोलापुर, अहमदनगर, सांगली सतारा कोल्हापुर, खनागिरि, लटूर तथा धीर (बीड) के जिले

[सं. 5/87/फा सं. 328/30/87-घ. 7.क]

ए. के. फोतेदार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1987

## ORDER

### WEALTH-TAX

S. O. 1669.—In partial modification of order No. 19(F.No. 328/118/72-WT) dated 8th June, 1973 and order No. 12/75 (F.No. 328/22/75-WT) dated 15-2-75, the Central Board of Direct Taxes that the entries against S.No. 66 and S. No. 77 in the Table appended to the aforesaid orders be substituted by the following:—

TABLE

S.No.	Designation of the Officer	Area
1	2	3
66	Valuation Officer/Assistant Valuation Officer (immovable property), Nagpur.	Districts of Bhandara, Nagpur, Nanded, Yeotmal, Akola, Amravati, Chanda, Aurangabad Jalna,

1	2	3
		Parbhani, Wardha, Osmanabad, and Buldhana.
77	Valuation Officer/Assistant Valuation Officer (immovable property), Sholapur.	Districts of Sholapur, Ahmednagar, Sangli, Satara, Kolhapur, Ratnagiri, Latur and Bhir (Beed)

[No. 5/87 / F.No. 328/30/87-WT]

A.K. FOTEDAR, Under Secy.

## आयकर विभाग

अरनाकुलम, 15 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1670 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय में आया कि विधिवत, 1957 की धारा 42क के अधीन निर्धारितियों के नाम और अन्य विविधियों को प्रकाशित किया जाना लोकहित में आवश्यक है और समीचीन है। अतः कोर्बान आयकर आयुक्त प्रसार में निम्न वर्ष 1935-86 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक शुद्ध धन पर धारण अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) के अधीन कर निर्धारित किए गए निम्नलिखित व्यष्टियों (ए. से सूचित किया गया है।) के नाम और अन्य विविधियों

जैसे (i) निर्धारण वर्ष  
(ii) विवरणी में दिखाया गया धन  
(iii) निर्धारित धन  
(iv) देय कर  
(v) प्रवर्तन (सभी रकम रुपये में) एतद्वारा प्रकाशित किए जाते हैं।

## व्यष्टि (ए)

(1) श्री के. पी. अश्विन करोर, आरंभ कारखाने, एरनाकुलम  
(i) 1981-82 (ii) 1013450 (iii) 1102700 (iv) 16930  
(v) 16930

(2) श्री ए. ए. अश्विन कार, एरनाकुलम (i) 83-84  
(ii) 434400 (iii) 13, 95, 200 (iv) 23,606 (v) 3074

(3) एम. के. अश्विन नारद, हारा पी. के. अश्विन नारद, पारमकुंड रोड, कोयिकोट (i) 1982-83 (ii) 10, 01, 000 (iii) 10, 01, 000 (iv) 13,500 (v) शून्य

(4) श्री पी. के. अश्विन मैसर्स पी. के. अश्विन एंड को. बिग बाजार, कोयिकोट (i) 1979-80 (ii) 5,96,600 (iii) 11,73,800  
(iv) 18,905 (v) 6,604

(5) - पत्नी- (i) 1980-81 (ii) 7,54,600 (iii) 13,68,400 (iv) 24,802 (v) 9,746

- (6) -बही- (i) 1981-82 (ii) 9,42,900 (iii) (iv) 16,45,600 (v) 36,026 (v) 12,360
- (7) श्री के. अलकम एस्तेम, कोल्लमकुलम (i) 1982-83 (ii) 1003400 (iii) 10034400 (iv) 13852 (v) 13952
- (8) श्रीमती गीतिस उम्मन, कार्म एस्टेट एंड रिजर्वी एम. (वी) लि. कोचीन - 3 (i) 1982-83 (ii) 959990 (iii) 1087100 (iv) 16366 (v) 16366
- (9) के. एस. ए. आर. चन्द्रप्रकाश, शिवकाशी (i) 1981-82 (ii) 914500 (iii) 1003100 (iv) 13845 (v) 11804
- (10) -बही- (i) 1982-83 (ii) 931700 (iii) 1004500 (iv) 13885 (v) 12142
- (11) पी. ए. एस. पुल्लिकुलम (i) 1984-85 (i) 1038300 (iii) 1060500 (iv) 15555 (v) 15555
- (12) सी. बा. जेकर, नेचुगाडम (i) 84-85 (ii) 133220 (iii) 1429500 (iv) 26635 (v) 26635
- (13) जोग पी. जेकर, कोचीन (i) 84-85 (ii) 1338400 (iii) 1826900 (iv) 45095 (v) 23899.
- (14) ए. कार्तिकेयन 1/60 बीच रोड, वेल्डिंग, कोल्लोट-5 (i) 1981-82 (ii) 30,000 (iii) 1143200 (iv) 18046 (v) शून्य
- (15) -बही- (i) 1982-83 (ii) 63,900 (iii) 11,67,500- (iv) 18,772 (v) शून्य .
- (16) ए. के. काबेरुट्टी परित्तुम वेणक, नारसेरो (i) 1981-82 (ii) 12,40,420 (iii) 18,90,900 (v) 48,295 (5) 20,351
- (17) पी. एम. चम्पल, वेल्डिंग बोर्ड एस्ट, कण्णूर (i) 83-84 (ii) 12,16,000 (iii) 14,30,300 (iv) 25,882 (v) 25,882
- (18) ए. माववी, बीच रोड, कोल्लोट (i) 1984-85 (ii) 6,28,100 (iii) 10,06,400 (iv) 13,942 (5) 6,188.
- (19) के. ए. मालू नोये पट्टूर (i) 83-84 (ii) 1131900 (iii) 1201600 (iv) 19798 (v) 19798.
- (20) सी. एन. संजु जोकुल्ला (i) 83-84 (ii) 804500 (iii) 1015600 (iv) 14218 (v) 14218.
- (21) -बही- (i) 84-85 (ii) 846700 (iii) 1057300- (iv) 15469 (v) 15469
- (22) निर्मलादेन कन्नूमाई, कोचीन-2 (i) 81-82 (ii) 633200 (iii) 1114200 (iv) 17127 (v) 15213.
- (23) निर्मलादेन कन्नूमाई, कोचीन-2 (i) 83-84 (ii) 792000 (iii) 1102500 (iv) 16324 (v) 16824
- (24) -बही- (i) 83-84 (ii) 909400 (iii) 1075400 (iv) 16012 (v) 16012
- (25) -बही- (i) 84-85 (ii) 10278250 (iii) 1197500 (iv) 196757 (v) 14585
- (26) पी. एम. पैली पिल्लेकोल्लेरी (i) 83-84 (ii) 132480 (iii) 1649400 (iv) 36633 (v) 36223
- (27) -बही- (i) 84-85 (ii) 1385200 (iii) 1524100 (iv) 29957 (v) 29957

- (28) सी. पी. पाप, तुरूर (i) 82-83 (ii) 949846 (iii) 1010800 (iv) 14074 (v) 14074
- (29) रवि चेरूर तुरूर (i) 76-77 (ii) 1458973 (iii) 1499200 (iv) 39968 (v) 39368
- (30) -बही- (i) 77-78 (ii) 1491200 (iii) 1626500 (iv) 30678 (v) 30678
- (31) -बही- (i) 78-79 (ii) 1551600 (iii) 1663000 (iv) 31956 (v) 31956
- (32) -बही- (i) 79-80 (ii) 1502667 (iii) 1684400 (iv) 32704 (v) 32704
- (33) शशि एल्लूर, कोल्लोट (i) 84-85 (ii) 1126727 (iii) 1367920 (iv) 24787 (v) 23270.
- (34) श्रीमती टी. नीतायमी, मासाट्टी, एरणाकुलम (i) 1981-82 (ii) 1519318 (iii) 1566500 (iv) 32075 (v) 32075.
- (35) पी. सुकुमारन, नोये परूर (i) 83-84 (ii) 999700 (iii) 1087500 (iv) 15895 (5) 13740.
- (36) श्री सोमम जोकर, कोल्लमकुलम, काजिरप्पली (i) 1981-82 (ii) 1310301 (iii) 1470400 (iv) 27865 (v) 27865
- (37) एम. ए. उण्णेरिकुट्टी, वेल्डिंग रोड, कोल्लोट 1981-82 (ii) (-) 5,02,800 (iii) 53,19,500 (iv) 2,19,725 (v) शून्य.
- (38) -बही- (i) 1982-83 (ii) (धनकर त्रिवरणी नहीं काइल की गयी है) (iii) 5671400 (iv) 247322 (v) शून्य
- (39) श्री ए. के. उम्मान, कुल्लमकुलम (i) 84-85 (ii) 1894600 (iii) 1894600 (iv) 48481 (v) 48481
- (40) बैकिटेश नामिक मोडुनवास, पायथस रोड, कोल्लोट (i) 1985-86 (ii) 769600 (iii) 1124100 (iv) 17473 (v) 8963.]

## INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT

Ernakulam, the 15th June, 1987

S.O. 1670.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish under section 42-A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957, the names and their particulars relating to the following individuals (Indicated by 'I') who have been assessed under the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs, in the Charge of the Commissioner of Wealth-tax Cochin, during the financial year 1985-86, such particulars like (i) Assessment year (ii) Wealth returned (iii) Wealth assessed (iv) Tax payable (v) Tax paid (all amounts in rupees) are hereby published.

## Individuals (I) :

1. Sri K. P. Abdul Kareem, Ananda Pharmacy, Ernakulam (i) 1981-82 (ii) 10,13,450 (iii) 11,02,700 (iv) 16,830 (v) 16,830.
2. Sri N. A. Abdul Khader, Ernakulam (i) 1983-84 (ii) 4,34,400 (iii) 13,95,200 (iv) 25,606 (v) 3,074.
3. Sri M. K. Abdul Nazar, C/o Sri M. K. Abdulkader Haji, Paramount Road, Calicut (i) 1982-83 (ii) 10,01,006 (iii) 10,01,000 (iv) 13,500 (v) nil.
4. Sri P. K. Ahamed, M/s P. K. Ahamed & Co., Big Bazaar, Calicut (i) 1979-80 (ii) 5,96,600 (iii) 11,73,800 (iv) 18,095 (v) 6,604.
5. Sri P. K. Ahamed M/s. P. K. Ahamed & Co., Big Bazaar, Calicut (i) 1980-81 (ii) 7,54,600 (iii) 13,68,400 (iv) 24,802 (v) 9,746.
6. Sri P. K. Ahamed, M/s. P. K. Ahamed & Co., Big Bazaar, Calicut (i) 1981-82 (ii) 9,42,900 (iii) 16,45,600 (iv) 36,026 (v) 12,360.

7. Sri K. Alex Abraham, Kollamkulam, Kanjirappally (i) 1982-83 (ii) 10,03,400 (iii) 10,03,400 (iv) 13,852 (v) 13,852.
8. Smt. Alice Ommen, Forbes Ewart & Figgis (P) Ltd., Cochin-3 (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,59,990 (iii) 10,87,100 (iv) 16,366 (v) 16,366.
9. Sri K. S. A. R. Chandraprakash, Sivakasi (i) 1981-82 (ii) 9,14,500 (iii) 10,03,100 (iv) 13,845 (v) 11,804.
10. K. S. A. R. Chandraprakash, Sivakasi (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,31,700 (iii) 10,04,500 (iv) 13,885 (v) 12,142.
11. Sri P. L. Issac, Puthencruz, (i) 1984-85 (ii) 10,38,300 (iii) 10,60,500 (iv) 15,555 (v) 15,555.
12. Sri C. V. Jacob, Nechupadam (i) 1984-85 (ii) 1,33,220 (iii) 14,29,500 (iv) 26,635 (v) 26,635.
13. Sri Joy P. Jacob, Kolencherry (i) 1984-85 (ii) 13,38,400 (iii) 18,26,900 (iv) 45,095 (v) 23,899.
14. Sri A. Karthikeyan, 1/60 Beach Road, West Hill, Calicut-5 (i) 1981-82 (ii) 39,000 (iii) 11,43,200 (iv) 18,046 (v) nil.
15. Sri A. Karthikeyan, 1/60, Beach Road, West Hill, chery (i) 1981-82 (ii) 12,40,420 (iii) 18,90,900 (iv) 48,295 (v) 20,351.
16. Sri A. K. Kaderkutty, Pallicoon Bungalow, Telli-cherry (i) 1981-82 (ii) 12,40,420 (iii) 18,90,900 (iv) 48,295 (v) 20,351.
17. Sri P. M. Lakshmanan, West Coast Weaving Estt. Cannanore (i) 1983-84 (ii) 13,16,000 (iii) 14,30,300 (iv) 25,882 (v) 25,882.
18. Smt. A. Madhavi, Beach Road, Calicut (i) 1984-85 (ii) 6,28,100 (iii) 10,06,400 (iv) 13,942 (v) 6,188.
19. Sri K. L. Mathew, N. Parur (i) 1983-84 (ii) 11,31,900 (iii) 12,1,600 (iv) 19,798 (v) 19,798.
20. Sri C. N. Nambudri, Thodupuzhe (i) 1983-84 (ii) 8,04,500 (iii) 10,15,600 (iv) 14,218 (v) 14,218.
21. C. N. Nambudri, Thodupuzha (i) 1984-85 (ii) 8,46,700 (iii) 10,57,300 (iv) 15,469 (v) 15,469.
22. Sri Nirmalaben Kakkubhai, Cochin-2 (i) 1981-82 (ii) 6,33,200 (iii) 11,14,200 (iv) 17,127 (v) 15,213.
23. Sri Nirmalaben Kakkubhai, Cochin-2 (i) 1982-83 (ii) 7,92,000 (iii) 11,02,500 (iv) 16,824 (v) 16,824.
24. Sri Nirmalaben Kakkubhai, Cochin-2 (i) 1983-84 (ii) 9,09,400 (iii) 10,75,400 (iv) 16,012 (v) 16,012.
25. Sri Nirmalaben Kakkubhai, Cochin-2 (i) 1984-85 (ii) 10,27,825 (iii) 11,97,500 (iv) 1,96,257 (v) 14,585.
26. Sri P. M. Pally Pillai, Kolencherry (i) 1983-84 (ii) 13,24,800 (iii) 16,49,400 (iv) 36,633 (v) 36,223.
27. Shri P. M. Pally Pillai Kolencherry (i) 1983-84 (ii) 13,85,200 (iii) 15,24,100 (iv) 29,957 (v) 29,957.
28. Sri C. P. Paul, Trichur (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,49,846 (iii) 10,10,800 (iv) 14,074 (v) 14,074.
29. Sri Ravi Cheloor, Trichur (i) 1976-77 (ii) 14,58,973 (iii) 14,99,200 (iv) 39,968 (v) 39,968.
30. Sri Ravi Cheloor, Trichur (i) 1977-78 (ii) 14,91,200 (iii) 16,26,500 (iv) 30,678 (v) 30,678.
31. Sri Ravi Cheloor, Trichur (i) 1978-79 (ii) 15,51,600 (iii) 16,63,000 (iv) 31,956 (v) 31,956.
32. Sri Ravi Cheloor, Trichur (i) 1979-80 (ii) 15,02,667 (iii) 16,84,400 (iv) 32,704 (v) 32,704.
33. Sri Sasi Elloor, Kolencherry (i) 1984-85 (ii) 11,26,727 (iii) 13,67,920 (iv) 24,787 (v) 23,270.

34. Smt. T. Seethalakshmi, Seematli, Ernakulam (i) 1981-82 (ii) 15,19,318 (iii) 15,66,500 (iv) 32,075 (v) 32,075.

35. Sri P. Sukuaran, N. Patur (i) 1983-84 (ii) 9,99,700 (iii) 10,87,500 (iv) 15,895 (v) 13,740.

36. Sri Thomas Jacob, Kollamkulam, Kanjirappally (i) 1981-82 (ii) 13,10,301 (iii) 14,70,000 (iv) 27,865 (v) 27,865.

37. Sri M. A. Unneerikutty, Cherooty Road, Calicut (i) 1981-82 (ii) (—) 5,02,800 (iii) 53,19,500 (iv) 2,19,725 (v) nil.

38. Sri M. A. Unneerikutty, Cherooty Road, Calicut (i) 1982-83 (ii) R/W not filed (iii) 56,71,400 (iv) 2,47,322 (v) nil.

39. Sri A. K. Usman, Kunnamkulam (i) 1984-85 (ii) 18,94,600 (iii) 18,94,600 (iv) 48,481 (v) 48,481.

40. Sri Venkitesh Naik Mohandas, Palayam Road, Calicut (i) 1985-86 (ii) 7,69,600 (iii) 11,24,100 (iv) 17,473 (v) 8,963.

का. अ. 1671.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय में धनकर अधिनियम 1957 की धारा 42-क के अधीन निर्धारितियों के नाम और अन्य विशिष्टियों को प्रकाशित किया जाना सोचने में आवश्यक और समुचित है। अतः कोचीन आयकर आयुक्त प्रभार में वित्तीय वर्ष 1984-85 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक शुद्धपत्र पर धन कर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) के अधीन कर निर्धारित किए गए निम्नलिखित व्यष्टियों (ऐ.) से सूचित किया गया है। के नाम और अन्य विशिष्टियाँ जैसे (i) निर्धारण वर्ष (ii) विवरणों में दिखाया गया धन (iii) निर्धारित धन (iv) देय कर (v) प्रदत्त कर (सभी रुकम रुपये में) एतद् द्वारा प्रकाशित किए जाने हैं।

व्यष्टि (ऐ.)

(1) श्री. के. अय्याय हाजी, चोम्मे टेक्स्टाइल्, कोयंबाड (i) 1981-82 (ii) 10,68,400 (iii) 11,66,300 (iv) 18,738 (v) 15,805

(2) —वही— (i) 1982-83 (ii) 10,78,100 (iii) 13,14,000 (iv) 23,158 (v) 16,093

(3) अमिता बाई, पायपयन्ने कोचीन-2 (i) 1980-81 (ii) 180,800 (iii) 16,22,700 (iv) 34,985 (v) धूम्र

(4) श्री ए.ए. योगन जाय, भाराह्वराविन बाई, कश्मिरा (i) 1981-82 (ii) 10,26,200 (iii) 10,27,500 (iv) 14,575 (v) 14,537

(5) के. पी. भास्करन, द्वारा मेरु के पी. कुतोयन एंड सन्स, कोयंबाड (i) 1980-81 (ii) 5,19,200 (iii) 19,75,300 (iv) 52,515 (v) 4,060.

(6) श्रीमती के. पी. एलियकुट्टी, श्रीमती कैरिन्स, तृशूर (i) 1983-84 (ii) 16,70,760 (iii) 16,88,600 (v) 37,778 (5) 37,778

(7) ग्राहम एच. काडूर, पी रोड, कोयंबाड— (i) 1981-82 (ii) 21,28,500 (iii) 21,20,300 (iv) 44,326 (v) 43,452

(8) —वही— (i) 1982-83 (ii) 17,93,100 (iii) 19,66,000 (iv) 35,953 (v) 35,953

(9) श्री के. बी. कोयन अय्यर, काङ्गिराविन्ने विन्नेय पायस्कड (i) 1983-84 (ii) 15,18,500 (iii) 15,13,500 (iv) 29,627 (v) 29,672.

(10) के. जेकरा मायू, कोल्लमकुलम, कांजिरप्पली (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,89,900 (iii) 10,60,700 (iv) 15, 571 (v) 15, 571

(11) एम.एम. कोडर, थेगई एस कोडर, कोचिन-1 (i) 1981-82, (ii) 32, 90, 540 (iii) 12, 90, 500 (iv) 22, 468 (v) 22,468

(12) —बही— (i) 1982-83 (ii) 12, 22, 500 (iii) 12,22,500 (iv) 20,427 (v) 20,427

(13) ए.के. कादर कूट्टी, पल्लिकुलम, कान्जिरापल्ली (i) 1980-81 (ii) 10,98,600 (iii) 12,47,700 (iv) 21,182 (v) 16,342

(14) श्री के.के. माथ्य, कोल्लकुलम, कान्जिरापल्ली (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,47,910 (iii) 10,65,900 (iv) 15,722 (v) 15,727

(15) श्री एस.एम. नारायणन, टवर हाउस, एम.जी. रोड, एरणाकुलम (i) 1983-84 (ii) 17,00,900 (iii) 17,41,900 (iv) 40,835 (v) 40,835

(16) —बही— (i) 1984-85 (ii) 14,31,200 (iii) 14,30,400 (iv) 26,662 (v) 26,662

(17) श्रीमती स्वर्णम नारायणन, श्रीती, चिट्टूर, रोड, एरणाकुलम (i) 1978-79 (ii) 8,65,900 (iii) 10,59,200 (iv) 15,230 (v) 15,230

(18) —बही— (i) 1979-80 (ii) 10,40,200 (iii) 15,80,400 (iv) 29,064 (v) 29,064

(19) —बही— (i) 1980-81 (ii) 12,45,200 (iii) 16,39,290 (iv) 35,710 (v) 35,710

(20) —बही— (i) 1981-82 (ii) 14,07,800 (iii) 16,84,300 (iv) 37,965 (v) 37,965

(21) —बही— (i) 1983-84 (ii) 15,10,600 (iii) 15,54,500 (iv) 31,476 (v) 31,476

(22) —बही— (i) 1983-84 (ii) 15,96,500 (iii) 17,01,400 (iv) 38,823 (v) 38,823

(23) —बही— (i) 1984-85 (ii) 14,44,500 (iii) 14,43,800 (iv) 27,064 (v) 27,064

(24) पी.ए. तोमरा विलफ्रेड, एरणाकुलम, (i) 1982-83 (ii) 14,64,700 (iii) 15,12,900 (iv) 29,395 (v) 29,395

(25) तोमरा जेकब, कोल्लकुलम, कान्जिरापल्ली (i) 1980-81 (ii) 14,57,290 (iii) 15,19,600 (iv) 29,727 (v) 27,470

(26) श्री ए.के. उम्मान द्वारा पावर होल्डर, ए.के. उम्मा, कुन्म-कुलम (i) 1983-84 (ii) 16,19,400 (iii) 17,14,600 (iv) 39,485 (v) 34,720

(27) एन.पी. वेंकटराम धर्मार, एन.पी. एक्सपेन्शन, पालक्काट (i) 1984-85 (ii) 9,74,500 (iii) 18,00,900 (iii) 22,778 (v) 22,779

अ्यक्तियों का संगम (ए ओ पी )

(1) पी.पी. बक्क द्वारा मुनक्को श्रीमती पी.पी. पात्तुम्माय्यो, पत्तायपुर हाउस, वेस्ट कल्लपि, कोपिन्कोट (i) 1984-85 (ii) 9,08,800 (iii) 10,50,505 (iv) 15,265 (v) 15,265

S.O. 1671.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish under section 42-A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957, the names and their particulars relating to the following individuals (Indicated by 'I') who have been assessed under the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs, in the Charge of the Commissioner of

Wealth-tax Cochin, during the financial year 1984-85, such particulars like (i) Assessment year (ii) Wealth returned (iii) Wealth assessed (iv) Tax payable (v) Tax paid (all amounts in rupees) are hereby published.

Individuals (I) :

1. Sri B. K. Abbas Haji, Bombay Textiles, Kanhangad (i) 1982-83 (ii) 10,78,100 (iii) 13,14,000 (iv) 18,738 (v) 15,805.
2. Sri B. K. Abbas Haji, -do- (i) 1982-83 (ii) 19,78,100 23,168 (v) 16,093.
3. Smt. Amina Bal, Panayappally, Cochin-2 (i) 1980-81 (ii) 1,80,800 (iii) 16,22,700 (iv) 34,885 (v) nil.
4. Sri. A. A. Beeran Haji, Arattuparambil Veedu, Karumanthira (i) 1981-82 (ii) 10,26,200 (iii) 10,27,500 (iv) 14,575 (v) 14,537.
5. Sri. K. P. Bhaskarman, C/o. M/s. K. P. Kunhiraman & Sons, Calicut (i) 1980-81 (ii) 5,19,200 (iii) 19,75,300 (iv) 52,515 (v) 4,060.
6. Smt. K. P. Eliakutty, Fashion Fabrics, Trichur (i) 1983-84 (ii) 16,70,760 (iii) 16,86,600 (iv) 37,778.
7. Sri. Gladys S. Koder, Church Road, Cochin-1 (i) 1981-82 (ii) 21,28,500 (iii) 21,20,300 (iv) 44,326 (v) 43,452.
8. Sri. Gladys S. Koder -do- (i) 1982-83 (ii) 17,93,400 (iii) 19,66,000 (iv) 35,953 (v) 35,953.
9. Sri. K. V. Gopala Iyer, Kodunthirappilly Village, Palghat (i) 1983-84 (ii) 15,18,500 (iii) 15,18,500 (iv) 29,672 (v) 29,672.
10. Sri. K. Jacob Mathew, Kollamkulam, Kanjirappally, (i) 1982-83 (ii) 8,89,900 (iii) 10,60,700 (iv) 15,571 (v) 15,571.
11. Sri. S. S. Koder, M/s. S. Koder, Cochin-1 (i) 1981-82 (ii) 12,90,540 (iii) 12,90,540 (iv) 22,468 (v) 22,468.
12. Sri S. S. Koder, M/s. S. Koder, Cochin-1 (i) 1982-83 (ii) 12,22,500 (iii) 12,22,500 (iv) 20,427 (v) 20,427.
13. Sri A. K. Kaderkutty, Pallicoon Bungalow, Tellicherry (i) 1980-81 (ii) 10,98,600 (iii) 12,47,700 (iv) 21,181 (v) 16,342.
14. Sri K. K. Mathew, Kollamkulam, Kanjirappally (i) 1982-83 (ii) 9,47,910 (iii) 10,65,900 (iv) 15,727 (v) 15,727.
15. Sri S. S. Narayanan, Tower House, M. G. Road, Ernakulam (i) 1983-84 (ii) 17,00,900 (iii) 17,41,700 (iv) 40,835 (v) 40,835.
16. Sri S. Narayanan, Tower House, M. G. Road, Ernakulam (i) 1984-85 (ii) 14,31,200 (iii) 14,30,400 (iv) 26,662 (v) 26,662.
17. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1978-79 (ii) 8,65,900 (iii) 10,59,200 (iv) 15,230 (v) 15,230.
18. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1979-80 (ii) 10,40,200 (iii) 15,80,400 (iv) 29,064 (v) 29,064.
19. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1980-81 (ii) 12,45,200 (iii) 16,39,290 (iv) 35,710 (v) 35,710.
20. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1981-82 (ii) 14,07,800 (iii) 16,84,300 (iv) 37,965 (v) 37,965.
21. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1982-83 (ii) 15,10,600 (iii) 15,54,500 (iv) 31,476 (v) 31,476.
22. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1983-84 (ii) 15,96,500 (iii) 17,01,400 (iv) 38,823 (v) 38,823.
23. Smt. Swarnam Narayanan, Preethy, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) 1984-85 (ii) 14,44,500 (iii) 14,43,800 (iv) 27,064 (v) 27,064.

24. Sri P. A. Thomas, Wilfred, Ernakulam (i) 1982-83 (ii) 14,64,700 (iii) 15,12,900 (iv) 29,395 (v) 29,395.
25. Sri Thomas Jacob, Kollemkulam, Kanjirappally (i) 1980-81 (ii) 14,57,290 (iii) 15,19,600 (iv) 29,727 (v) 27,470.
26. Si A. K. Usman by Power Holder A. K. Ummer, Kunnankulam (i) 1983-84 (ii) 16,19,400 (iii) 17,14,600 (iv) 39,485 (v) 34,720.
27. Sri N. P. Venkitarama Iyer, Nurani Extension, Palghat (i) 1984-85 (ii) 9,74,500 (iii) 18,00,900 (iv) 22,778 (v) 22,778.

Association of Persons (A.O.P.).

1. Sri P. P. Waki, by Muthavally Smt. P. P. Pathumabi, Pathayapura House, West Kallai, Calicut (i) 1984-85 (ii) 9,08,800 (iii) 10,50,500 (iv) 15,265 (v) 15,265.

का.पा. 1672.—घायक अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 287 के अधीन राजस्व विभाग (केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड) द्वारा सूचित किए गए भारत सरकार के निर्देश के अनुमरण में कोचिन घायक, घायक एतद्-द्वारा वित्तीय वर्ष 1984-85 के संबंध में निम्नलिखित सूचनाएं प्रकाशित करते हैं।

अनुसूची-1-ए.—इसमें जिन व्यक्तियों या हिन्दू परिवार कुटुंबों पर 2 लाख रुपए से अधिक आय पर कर निर्धारित किया गया है, उनके नाम, पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची-1-बी.—इसमें जिन कंपनियों, फर्मों तथा व्यक्तियों के संगम पर 10 लाख रुपए से अधिक आय पर कर निर्धारण किया गया है, उनके नाम, पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची-II.—घाय की विवरणी ठीक समय के भीतर प्रस्तुत करने में जो असफल हो गए हैं या लेखा बहियां पेज करने में असमर्थ हुए हैं या आय छिपाने के कारण वित्तीय वर्ष 1984-85 में रु. 5,000/- या उससे अधिक, जिन पर श्रावित लगायी गयी है या गत वर्षों की श्रावितियों के विरुद्ध दिए गए अपील या पुनरीक्षण के फैसले में 1984-85 वित्तीय वर्ष में, जिन पर रु. 5,000/- या उससे अधिक श्रावित निश्चित की गयी है उन व्यक्तियों के नाम, पते व अन्य विवरण इसमें विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची-3 — इसमें उन व्यक्तियों के नाम, पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं, जो एक लाख रुपए या उससे अधिक राशि का कर प्रदा करने में असमर्थ हो गए हैं और यह समय वित्तीय वर्ष 1984-85 के अंतिम दिन तक दो वर्ष या उससे अधिक हो गया है।

2. अनुसूची 1-ए और अनुसूची 1-बी में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं :

(i) हैसियत (ii) निर्धारण वर्ष (iii) विवरणी में दिखायी गयी आय (iv) निर्धारित आय (v) वेब घायक और (vi) प्रदत्त घायक

अनुसूची-II में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं :—(i) हैसियत (ii) निर्धारण वर्ष (iii) श्रावित की राशि (iv) श्रावित की किस्म। अनुसूची-III में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं :

(i) ब्याज गृहित कर (ii) श्रावित और (iii) जोड़ (सभी एकम रुपए में हैं)।

3. हैसियत की सूचनाएं इस प्रकार हैं : 'ए'—व्यक्तियों के लिए, 'एफ'—हिन्दू अभिभक्त कुटुंबों के लिए, 'क'—कंपनियों के लिए, 'एफ'—फर्मों के लिए, 'ए.आ.पी.'—व्यक्तियों के संगम के लिए और 'आर'—प्रतिनिधि निर्धारितों के लिए।

अनुसूची-1-ए

(i) स्व. पी.ई. श्रम्य, प्रतिनिधि द्वारा : पी.ए. शशीचन्द्रन और श्रम्य, कोडुंगलूर (i) ए (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 544870 (iv) 560360 (v) 380112 (vi) 157732

(2) श्री बाबू पॉल, कोलंबो (i) ए (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 188660 (iv) रुबि 2005 (v) 201630 (vi) 115558 (vii) 102295.

(3) श्री के. भास्करन, मूवाट्टुम्बा (i) ए (ii) 1979-80 (iii) 8950 (iv) 325070 (v) 379995 (vi) शून्य।

(4) श्री धर्मराजन नायर, उलोम्पंडन (i) ए (ii) 1975-86 (iii) (—) (iv) 265810 (v) 181915 (vi) 51191

(5) श्री दिवीपकुमार के. मेहता, मैसूर सी.के. एन. मेहता एंड को, कोचिन-2 (i) ए (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 205920 (iv) 201160 (v) 113027 (vi) 113027

(6) के.ए. एलियकुट्टी, तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 430590 (iv) 432600 (v) 263324 (vi) 263134

(7) श्री के.टी. फ्रांसिस, पेपरमार्ट, तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 211260 (iv) 214140 (v) 120851 (vi) 120851

(8) श्री के. जे. फ्रांसिस, मैसूर फॉर्म फाब्रिक तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1976-77 (iii) 234680 (vi) 297130 (v) 205349 (vi) 198217.

(9) श्री के.जे. फ्रांसिस, कैथन फाब्रिक, तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1977-78 (iii) 324330 (iv) 520970 (v) 320960 (vi) 317406

(10) श्री के.जे. फ्रांसिस, कैथन फाब्रिक, तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 410350 (iv) 457020 (v) 279441 (vi) 279441.

(11) श्री सी.डी. जोर्ज, तूरगूर (i) ए (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 221500 (iv) 239030 (v) 148334 (vi) 134520

(12) श्री सी.पी. जोण, चिट्टापिल्ली आयल मिल्स, पोन्नानि (i) ए (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 241660 (iv) 243660 (v) 141549 (vi) 141549

(13) श्री ए.पी. जोम, अधिनिकल हासिस, कंजूर (i) ए (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 635200 (iv) 646810 (v) 443173 (vi) 65517

(14) श्रीमती पी. कार्तियायनी अम्मा, इरिलकुडा (i) ए (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 258430 (iv) 26442 (v) 152132 (i) 152132।

(15) श्री सी.आर. केजवन वैधर, इरिलकुडा (i) ए (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 279710 (iv) 310200 (v) 182512 (vi) 182512

(16) स्व. ए.मोह्यु, प्रतिनिधि द्वारा; अलकस मॉह्यु, कोट्टयम (i) ए (ii) 1978-79 (iii) 165360 (iv) 208110 (v) 127002 (vi) 127002

(17) स्व. ए.मोह्यु, प्रतिनिधि द्वारा; अलकस मॉह्यु, कोट्टयम (i) ए (ii) 1979-80 (iii) 261160 (iv) 272910 (v) 169508 (6) 169508

(18) स्व. मेहनकुमार के. मेहता, प्रतिनिधि द्वारा; मैसूर मधुमे एम. मेहता, कोचिन-2 (i) ए (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 202890 (iv) 202900 (v) 111027 (vi) 111027

(19) श्री के. एस. मंगल, मैसूर ग्राम पञ्चेस्वीप, कोचिन-2 (1) ए (2) 1982-83 (3) 202710 (5) 196220 (5) 110928 (6) 110982



(20) श्री आर नटराजन रत्ना फोटो एवोरियम, पालवडाट  
(1) फे (2) 1982-83 (3) 202030 (4) 202030 (5)  
100960 (6) 100960

(21) श्री केएम नथ्या मेसेर्स इयाम एजेन्सी, कोचिन-2 (1)  
फे (2) 1982-83 (3) 205270 (4) 193460 (5) 112598  
(6) 112598

(22) श्री पी एम पैली पिहने, कोलचेरी (1) फे (2) 1982-83  
(1) 238240 (4) 255380 (5) 161295 (6) 136651

(23) श्री टी आर पैली, तुशूर (1) आर (2) 1982-83  
(3) 191810 (4) 209610 (5) 115710 (6) 115710

(24) श्री पी आर पालू मृशूर (1) ए (2) 1980-81  
(3) 261030 (4) 265950 (5) 167604 (6) 163976

(25) श्री पी ए रवीन्द्रन पालकुल्ल हाउस, काडुगल्लूर (1)  
फे (2) 1980-81 (3) 632586 (5) 630990 (5) 434134  
(6) 125854

(26) श्री पी ए शार्मिन्दन, पालकुल्ल हाउस, काडुगल्लूर (1) फे  
(2) 1980-81 (3) 626250 (4) 628210 (5) 432161  
(6) 150916

(27) श्रीमती ए शार्मिन्दन (1) आर (2) 1983-84 (3)  
226260 (4) 226300 (5) 127166 (6) 127166

(28) श्री टी वी जी बेणोय मनिटकी रूयामेट स्टार्स, कोचिन -  
31 (1) फे (2) 1982-83 (3) 344820 (4) 306580 (5)  
198101 (6) 179463

(29) श्री के एम श्याम मेसेर्स श्याम एजेन्सी, कोचिन 2  
(1) ए (2) 1982-83 (3) 205330 (4) 205350 (5)  
112651 (6) 112651

(30) श्री सूर्यकांत के मेहता, मेसेर्स सी के एन मेहता एड  
को, कोचिन-2 (1) ए (2) 1982-83 (3) 208310 (4)  
207080 (5) 114624 (6) 114624

(31) श्रीमती सी के बत्तला, मेसेर्स लाल प्रोड्यूसर्स, एरणाकुलम  
(1) फे (2) 1982-83 (3) 693900 (4) 706640 (5)  
143502 (6) 443502

(32) श्री सी एन वासनप्रम, टयर डीलर, कोचिन-6 (1) फे  
(2) 1981-82 (3) 211060 (4) 23950 (हार्मि) (5)  
116420 (6) 93120

#### अनुसूची-1 बी

(1) अस्पिनडाल एड को लि, काचिन (1) क (2) 1982-83  
(3) 18,14,400 (4) 2111,240 (5) 11,53,283 (6)  
11,29,802

(2) मेसेर्स अब्बास फिशनेस, कोचिन (1) क (2) 1982-83  
(3) 7,30,200 (4) 38,99,030 (5) 12,44,484 (6) 3,76,915

(3) कैथ्यू कार्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया लि, काचिन (1) क  
(2) 1982-83 (3) 1,63,98,120 (4) 1,63,98,210 (5)  
92,44,490 (6) 92,44,490

(4) आकाशम स्पिनगि एड बीविंग मिल्स लि काचिन (1)  
क (2) 1982-83 (3) 14,31,320 (4) 2636,560 (5)  
1621,494 (6) 8,82,907

(5) मेसेर्स वायटाट एजेन्सी (1) एफ (2) 1981-82 (3)  
25,11,440 (4) 25,94,540 (5) 671,299 (6) 661,947

(6) कोचिन मलबार एस्टेट्स एंड इन्स्टीट्यूट्स लि (1) क  
(2) 1982-83 (3) 7,54,090 (4) 11,06,130 (5) 62,3,580  
(6) 6,23,580,

477 GI/87-2

(7) इंडियन ट्रान्सफॉर्मर्स लि (1) क (2) 1982-83  
(3) 13,46,650 (4) 14,40,420 (5) 9,12,036 (6) 7,58,434

(8) इंडियन ट्रान्सफॉर्मर्स लि (1) ए (2) 1981-82  
(3) 14,21,640 (4) 15,03,760 (5) 9,58,010 (6)  
8,00,491

(9) विण्टिगल टेकटेल्स मृशूर (1) एफ (2) 1976-77  
(3) 13,95,430 (4) 15,85,430 (5) 4,03,153 (6) 4,03,153

(10) मेसेर्स लाल प्रोड्यूसर्स (1) एफ (2) 1983-84 (3)  
14,95,230 (4) 16,00,060 (5) 4,07,015 (6) 1,07,015

(11) मेसेर्स महावीर प्लान्टेशन (पी) लि काचिन (1) क  
(2) 1981-82 (3) — 17,57,920 (4) 10,87,760  
(5) 8,19,127 (6) 2,01,687

(12) सलवालम प्लान्टेशन (पी) लि, काचिन (1) क (2)  
(2) 1983-84 (3) 77,72,230 (4) 77,72,230 (5)  
23,98,992 (6) 23,89,992

(13) आ ई एन इंडिया लि, बैटिला (1) क (2) 1981-82  
(3) 12,50,900 (4) 31,01,120 (5) 19,35,959 (6)  
16,91,223

(14) फार्मस्पूटिकल कार्पोरेशन इंडिया, तुशूर (1) क (2)  
1982-83 (3) 10,19,360 (4) 10,18,560 (5) 5,74,213  
(6) 5,74,213

(15) प्रीमोर प्रिवेरीस, काजिकाड, पालवडाट (1) क (2)  
1983-84 (3) 20,50,120 (4) 23,25,610 (5) 13,10,267  
(6) 13,10,267

(16) प्रीमोर प्रिवेरीस लि, काजिकाड (1) क (2) 1981-82  
(3) 1,07,50,039 (4) 1,13,13,570 (5) 66,99,140 (6)  
66,89,149

(17) मेसेर्स पुवल्ल पारी एड मयम (1) एफ (2) 1982-83  
(3) 10,77,860 (4) 11,10,230 (5) 3,76,563 (6)  
(C) 2,37,582

(18) मेसेर्स मराफ ट्रेडिंग कार्पोरेशन (1) एफ (2) 1982-83  
(3) 95,19,490 (4) 96,49,180 (5) 25,31,983 (6)  
25,31,983

(19) मेसेर्स मनार्ण केबल एंड इजिनियरिंग वर्कस काचिन  
(1) एफ (2) 1981-82 (3) 18,21,550 (4) 21,32,360 (5)  
5,47,543 (6) 5,47,543

(20) मिर्चैट इंडस्ट्रियल (पी) लि (1) क (2) 1982-83  
(3) 15,94,660 (4) 15,77,070 (5) 9,69,899 (6) 9,74,566

(21) ट्रावेंट केबिंस लि (1) क (2) 1982-83 (3)  
40,08,070 (4) 12,21,450 (5) 25,22,535 (6) 22,93,719

#### अनुसूची-II

—शून्य—

#### अनुसूची III

(1) अशुता मोहम्मद, कनकगोड (1) 1,26,197 (2) 32,296  
(3) 1,48,793

(2) ए ए आ साहम्मद डी की कार्मिफोड (1) 377999  
(2) 1,11,648 (3) 6,99,637

(3) मेसेर्स एम एम एन सलवालम मल्लिक एड ब्रदर्स काडुवायूर  
(1) 1,10,938 (2) — (3) 1,40,938

(4) सी सुभाष चंद्र बम्बत क मरगोट (1) 1,28,373 (2)—  
(3) 1,28,783

S.O. 1672.—Pursuant to the direction of the Government of India under section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, conveyed by the Department of Revenue (Central Board of Direct Taxes), the Commissioner of Income-tax Cochin, hereby publishes the following information with references to the financial year 1984-85.

Schedule-IA, contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of individuals and Hindu Undivided Families assessed on an income of more than Rs. 2 lakhs.

Schedule-IB, contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of Companies, Firms and Associations of persons assessed on an income of more than Rs. 10 lakhs.

Schedule-II, contains names, addresses and other particulars in respect of persons on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5000 was imposed during the financial year 1984-85 for failure to file a return of income in time or to produce books of account, or for concealment of income, or in whose cases such penalties have been confirmed in appeal or revision during the financial year 1984-85 to an extent of Rs. 5,000 or more.

Schedule-III, contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of persons who have been in default of payment of tax, amounting to Rs. 1 lakh or more, for over two years as on the last day of the financial year 1984-85.

2. The particulars given in Schedule-IA and Schedule-IB are (i) Status (ii) assessment year (iii) income returned (iv) income assessed (v) income-tax payable and (vi) income-tax paid.

The particulars given in Schedule II are (i) Status (ii) assessment year (iii) amount of penalty and (iv) nature of penalty.

The particulars given in Schedule III are (i) tax including interest (ii) penalty and (iii) total (all amounts are in rupees).

3. Status is indicated by 'I' for individuals, 'H.U.F.' for Hindu Undivided Families, 'Co.' for Companies 'F' for Firms 'A.O.P.' for Association of persons and 'R' for representative assesses.

#### Schedule-IA :

1. Late Sri P. E. Appoo, represented by Sri P. A. Saseendran & Others, Kodungalloor (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 5,44,870 (iv) 5,60,360 (v) 3,80,112 (vi) 1,57,732.
2. Sri Babu Paul, Kolencherry (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 1,88,660 and Agrl. 2,000 (iv) 2,01,630 (v) 1,15,558 (vi) 1,02,295.
3. Sri K. Bhaskaran, Muvattupuzha (i) I (ii) 1979-80 (iii) -8,950 (iv) 3,25,070 (v) 3,79,995 (vi) nil.
4. Sri Dharmarajan Nair, Udyogamandal (i) I (ii) 1975-76 (iii) nil (iv) 2,65,810 (v) 1,81,915 (vi) 51,191.
5. Sri Dilipkumar K. Mehta, M/s. C. K. N. Mehta & Co., Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,05,920 (iv) 2,01,160 (v) 1,13,027 (vi) 1,13,027.
6. Sri K. A. Eliakutty, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 4,30,590 (iv) 4,32,600 (v) 2,63,324 (vi) 2,63,324.
7. Sri K. T. Francis, Peper Mart, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 2,11,260 (iv) 2,14,140 (v) 1,20,851 (vi) 1,20,851.
8. Sri K. J. Francis, M/s Fashion Fabrics, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1976-77 (iii) 2,84,880 (iv) 2,97,130 (v) 2,05,349 (vi) 1,98,217.
9. Sri K. I. Francis, Fashion Fabrics, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1977-78 (iii) 3,24,330 (iv) 5,20,970 (v) 3,20,960 (vi) 3,17,406.
10. Sri K. I. Francis, Fashion Fabrics, Trichur. (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 4,10,850 (iv) 4,57,020 (v) 2,79,441 (vi) 2,79,441.
11. Sri C. D. George, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 2,21,500 (iv) 2,39,030 (v) 1,48,334 (vi) 1,34,520.

12. Sri C. P. John, Chirtillappilly Oil Mills, Ponnani (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 2,43,660 (iv) 2,43,660 (v) 1,41,549 (vi) 1,41,549.
13. Sri A. P. Jose, Ayimikkal House, Kundoor (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 6,35,200 (iv) 6,46,810 (v) 4,43,173 (vi) 65,517.
14. Smt. P. Karthiayani Amma, Irinjalakuda (i) I (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 2,58,430 (iv) 2,64,420 (v) 1,52,132 (vi) 1,52,132.
15. Sri C. R. Kesavan Vadhyar, Irinjalakuda (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,79,710 (iv) 3,10,200 (v) 1,82,512 (vi) 1,82,512.
16. Late A. Mathew, represented by Alex Mathew, Kottayam (i) I (ii) 1978-79 (iii) 1,65,360 (iv) 2,08,110 (v) 1,27,002 (vi) 1,27,002.
17. Late A. Mathew, represented by Alex Mathew, Kottayam (i) I (ii) 1979-80 (iii) 2,61,160 (iv) 2,72,910 (v) 1,69,508 (vi) 1,69,508.
18. Late Mahendrakumar K. Mehta represented by Mrs. M. Mehta, Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,02,890 (iv) 2,02,900 (v) 1,11,027 (vi) 1,11,027.
19. Sri K. S. Mangal, M/s. Syam Agencies, Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,02,740 (iv) 1,96,220 (v) 1,10,928 (vi) 1,10,928.
20. Sri R. Natarajan, Rathna Photo Emporium, Palghat (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,02,030 (iv) 2,02,030 (v) 1,00,960 (vi) 1,00,960.
21. Sri K. S. Navya, M/s. Syam Agencies, Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,05,270 (iv) 1,93,450 (v) 1,12,598 (vi) 1,12,598.
22. Sri P. M. Paily Pillai, Kolencherry (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,38,240 (iv) 2,55,380 (v) 1,61,295 (vi) 1,36,651.
23. Sri T. R. Paily, Trichur (i) R (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 1,91,810 (iv) 2,09,610 (v) 1,15,710 (vi) 1,15,710.
24. Sri P. T. Palu, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 2,61,030 (iv) 2,65,950 (v) 1,67,604 (vi) 1,63,976.
25. Sri P. A. Raveendran, Polakulath House, Kodungalloor (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 6,32,500 (iv) 6,30,980 (v) 4,34,134 (vi) 1,55,854.
26. Sri P. A. Saseendran, Polakulath House, Kodungalloor (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 6,26,250 (iv) 6,28,240 (v) 4,32,161 (vi) 1,50,916.
27. Smt. A. Shahirabi (i) R (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,26,160 (iv) 2,26,300 (v) 1,27,166 (vi) 1,27,166.
28. Sri T. V. G. Shenoy, Sanitary Equipment Stores, Cochin-3J (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 3,34,820 (iv) 3,06,580 (v) 1,98,101 (vi) 1,79,463.
29. Sri K. S. Shyam, M/s. Shvam Agencies, Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,05,330 (iv) 2,05,350 (v) 1,12,651 (vi) 1,12,651.
30. Sri Suryakant K. Mehta, M/s. C. K. N. Mehta & Co., Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,08,340 (iv) 2,07,080 (v) 1,14,624 (vi) 1,14,624.
31. Smt. C. K. Valsala, M/s. Ial Products, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 6,93,900 (iv) 7,06,640 (v) 4,43,502 (vi) 4,43,502.
32. Sri C. N. Vamana Prabhu, Tvre Dealer, Cochin-6 (i) I (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 2,11,060 (iv) 23,950 (loss) (v) 1,16,420 (vi) 93,120.

#### Schedule-IB :

1. M/s. Aspinwall & Co. Ltd., Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 18,14,000 (iv) 21,11,240 (v) 11,53,283 (vi) 11,29,802.
2. M/s. Abad Fisheries Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 7,30,200 (iv) 38,98,030 (v) 12,44,484 (vi) 3,76,945.
3. M/s. Cashew Corporation of India Ltd. Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 1,63,98,120 (iv) 1,63,98,210 (v) 92,44,490 (vi) 92,44,490.

4. M/s. Chakolas Spinning & Weaving Mills Ltd., Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 14,34,320 (iv) 26,36,560 (v) 16,21,484 (vi) 8,82,907.
5. M/s. Chakiat Agencies (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 25,11,440 (iv) 25,94,540 (v) 6,71,299 (vi) 6,61,047.
6. Cochin Malabar Estates & Industries Ltd. (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 7,54,080 (iv) 11,06,130 (v) 6,23,580 (vi) 6,23,580.
7. Indian Transformers Ltd. (i) Co. (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 13,46,650 (iv) 14,40,420 (v) 8,12,036 (vi) 7,58,434.
8. Indian Transformers Ltd. (i) Co. (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 14,21,640 (iv) 15,03,760 (v) 8,58,010 (vi) 8,00,494.
9. Kinattungal Textiles Trichur (i) F (ii) 1976-77 (iii) 13,85,430 (iv) 15,85,430 (v) 4,03,153 (vi) 4,03,153.
10. M/s. Lal Products (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 14,95,230 (iv) 16,00,060 (v) 4,07,015 (vi) 4,07,015.
11. M/s. Mahavir Plantation (P) Ltd., Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1981-82 (iii) (-) 17,57,920 (iv) 10,87,760 (v) 8,19,427 (vi) 2,01,687.
12. Malayalam Plantation (P) Ltd., Cochin (i) Co. (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 77,72,230 (iv) 77,72,230 (v) 23,88,892 (vi) 23,88,892.
13. O. E. N. India Ltd. Vyttila (i) Co. (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 12,80,900 (iv) 31,01,120 (v) 19,35,959 (vi) 16,91,223.
14. Pharmaceutical Corporation India, Trichur (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 10,19,380 (iv) 10,18,560 (v) 5,74,213 (vi) 5,74,213.
15. Premier Breweries, Kanjikode, Palghat (i) Co. (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 20,50,120 (iv) 23,25,640 (v) 13,10,267 (vi) 13,10,267.
16. Premier Cable Co., Karukutty (i) Co. (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 1,07,50,039 (iv) 1,13,13,570 (v) 66,89,149 (vi) 66,89,149.
17. M/s. Poovath Paray & Sons (i) F (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 10,77,860 (iv) 11,10,230 (v) 3,76,563 (vi) 2,37,582.
18. M/s. Saraf Trading Corporation (i) F (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 95,49,490 (iv) 96,49,180 (v) 25,31,983 (vi) 25,31,983.
19. M/s. Southern Cables & Engg. Works, Cochin. (i) F (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 18,21,550 (iv) 21,32,360 (v) 5,47,543 (vi) 5,47,543.
29. Synthite Industrial (p) Ltd. (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 95,49,490 (iv) 96,49,180 (v) 25,31,983 (vi) 9,74,566.
21. Traco Cables Co. Ltd. (i) Co. (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 40,08,070 (iv) 42,21,451 (v) 25,22,535 (vi) 22,93,740.

## Schedule-II

## NIL

## Schedule-III

- (1) Abdulla Mohammed, Kasaragod (i) 1,26,497 (ii) 32,296 (iii) 1,48,793.
- (2) A. P. Mohammed Haji (Late), Calicut (i) 5,77,989 (ii) 1,11,648 (iii) 6,89,637
- (3) M/s. M. S. M. Saliheen Sahib & Bros., Koduvayur. (i) 1,40,938 (ii) — (iii) 1,40,938
- (4) C. Subash Chandrakamath, Kasaragod (i) 1,28,783 (ii) — (iii) 1,28,783

का. आ. 1673 —आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 287 के अधीन राजस्व विभाग (केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड) द्वारा सूचित किए गए भारत सरकार के निर्देश के अनुसरण में कोचिन आयकर आयुक्त एम.आर. विलीयम वर्ष 1985-86 के संदर्भ में निम्नलिखित सूचनाएं प्रकाशित करते हैं।

अनुसूची I : इसमें जिन व्यक्तियों या हिन्दु अधिभक्त कुटुंबों पर 2 लाख रुपए से अधिक आयपर कर निर्धारित किया गया है, उनके नाम पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची-1 बी : इसमें जिन कम्पनियों, फर्मों तथा व्यक्तियों के संगम पर 10 लाख रु. से अधिक आयपर कर निर्धारित किया गया है, उनके नाम, पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची II : आय की विवरणी टीका समय के भीतर प्रस्तुत करने में जो असफल हो गए हैं या लेखा बहियां पेश करने में असमर्थ हुए हैं या आय छिपाने के कारण वित्तीय वर्ष 1985-86 में रु. 5,000/ या उससे अधिक, जिनपर शास्ति लगायी गयी है या गत वर्षों की शास्तियों के विरुद्ध दिए गए अपील या पुनरीक्षण के फैसले में 1985-86 वित्तीय वर्ष में, जिनपर रु. 5,000/ या उससे अधिक शास्ति निर्धारित की गयी है उन व्यक्तियों के नाम, पते व अन्य विवरण इसमें विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची-III : इसमें उन व्यक्तियों के नाम, पते और अन्य विवरण विनिर्दिष्ट किए गए हैं, जो एक लाख रुपये या उससे अधिक राशि का कर भुगतान करने में असमर्थ हो गए हैं और यह समय वित्तीय वर्ष 1985-86 के अंतिम दिन तक दो वर्ष या उससे अधिक हो गया है।

2. अनुसूची-1 ए और अनुसूची-1बी में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं।

(1) हैसियत (2) निर्धारण वर्ष (3) विवरणी में दिखायी गयी आय (4) निर्धारित आय (5) देय आयकर और (6) प्रदत्त आयकर

अनुसूची-II में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं (1) हैसियत (2) निर्धारित वर्ष (3) शास्ति की राशि (4) शास्ति की विस्तार।

अनुसूची-III में दिए गए विवरण इस प्रकार हैं (1) व्याज सहित कर (2) शास्ति और (3) जोड़ (सभी रकम रुपये में हैं)

3. हैसियत की सूचनाएं इस प्रकार हैं — "ए" व्यक्तियों के लिए ; एच. यू. एफ हिन्दु अधिभक्त कुटुंबों के लिए, "क" कंपनियों के लिए 'एक' फर्मों के लिए, "ए. ओ. पी." व्यक्तियों के संगम के लिए और 'भार' प्रतिनिधि निर्धारितों के लिए।

## अनुसूची—1 ए

(1) श्री प्रभुल हजीव, चावकाट (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 334570 (iv) 544010 (v) 347357 (vi) 347357

(2) श्री ए. प्रभुल रघूक, चावकाट (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 1032450 (iv) 1033320 (v) 679507 (vi) 679507

(3) श्री ए. प्रभुल शफीक, चावकाट (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 551030 (iv) 552220 (v) 332898 (vi) 352898

(4) श्री के.आर. आबूबेकर, वान्नानि (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 209811 (iv) 215420 (v) 119985 (vi) 119985

(5) श्री सी.एल. आनंद, तोपिवा आनंद बाटरीय, एरणाकुलम, (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 250120 (iv) 250120 (v) 120192 (vi) 120192

(6) श्रीमती प्रानी पाल, काश्मिरिपू (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 359280 (iv) 359280 (v) 201464 (vi) 201464

(7) मिमिस कातरन पाल, चाकोला अवन, तुरशूर (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 3685710 (iv) 368200 (v) 220820 (vi) 220820

(8) श्री सी. चाको (i) ए (ii) 81-82 (iii) 242760 (iv) 254390 (v) 151917 (vi) 104180

(9) श्री सी. चाको (i) ए (ii) 82-83 (iii) 217400 (iv) 23837

(5) 139834 (vi) 100315

(10) श्री एम. चाको पिल्लै, कोलचेरी (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 225830 (iv) 227060 (v) 132313 (vi) 132313

(11) श्री के. जेम्स एलम्पाकोड (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 301200 (iv) 301200 (v) 176606 (vi) 176606

(12) श्री दिलीपकुमार के. मेहता, मेनेस सी. के. एन. मेहता एड को., कोबन-2 (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 212460 (iv) 214660

(13) श्री के. दिवाकर बेगोय, मेनेस, के.बी.एन. बेगोय एड को. कणूर (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 242890 (iv) 243220 (v) 138333 (vi) 138333

(14) श्री के.पी. नेल्सन, नेल्सन ट्रस्ट, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 82-83 (iii) 211880 (iv) 211880 (v) 194199 (vi) 194199

(15) श्री के.पी. नेल्सन, नेल्सन ट्रस्ट, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 238460 (iv) 266070 (v) 246668 (vi) 246668

(16) डा. ए. गोपा, 1/60, बाब रोड, कोयिकोट (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 57260 (iv) 230170 (v) 170955 (vi) 19893

(17) श्री के.पी. गोपालन, कुमातेल्लूर (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 106010 (iv) 1063810 (v) 636014 (vi) 636014

(18) श्री ए.पी. हंफकोस, पदार्थतोषु एड, कुंडाट, कोयिकोट-3 (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 295000 (iv) 300000 (v) 163406 (vi) 163406

(19) श्री ए.पी. जेहद (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 271150 (iv) 306740 (v) 190315 (vi) 190315

(20) श्री जयकाश सी. एन., रामारंज आनन, एड कलार मिस्त्र. कणूर (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 203610 (iv) 203610 (v) 101991 (vi) 101991

(21) श्रीमती पी. कार्मल्लोस श्रमा, हरिनाथुडा (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 396650 (iv) 415490 (v) 252031 (vi) 252031

(22) श्री टी.टी. कुन्जयन, कोनमगम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 295340 (iv) 295340 (v) 160647 (vi) 160647

(23) श्री के. कुजिरामन, कणूर (i) ए (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 291510 (iv) 291510 (v) 158154 (vi) 158154

(24) श्री पी. कुरियन, अइन्नेड, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 210570 (iv) 218080 (v) 121740 (vi) 121740

(25) श्री महेन्द्रकुमार के. मेहता, द्वारा सी. के. एन. मेहता एड को., कोबन-2 (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 211170 (iv) 211600 (v) 117461 (vi) 117461

(26) श्रीमती के.पी. मेरी काथलिक (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 367340 (iv) 367340 (v) 206451 (vi) 206451

(27) श्री एम.ए. मथ्यू (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 211820 (iv) 259110 (v) 164746 (vi) 164746

(28) श्री नजिन बी. मंन, मेनेस संयत एडरमदन, कोमा आजार, कोयिकोट (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 723610 (iv) 738620 (v) 444129 (vi) 425515

(29) श्री ए.एन. नायडन, प्रीति, विन्ड रोड, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 370530 (iv) 368530 (v) 222040 (vi) 222040

(30) श्री ए.एन. नायडन, प्रीति, विन्ड रोड, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 366300 (iv) 366300 (v) 224331 (vi) 224331

(31) श्रीमती के. पदार्थतोषु कोयिकोट (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 154560 (iv) 243960 (v) 141751 (vi) 141751

(32) श्री पी.एम. पैली पिल्लै, कोलचेरी (i) ए (ii) 80-81 (iii) 201010 (iv) 207010 (v) 123007 (vi) 123007

(33) श्री पी.एम. पैली पिल्लै, कोलचेरी (i) ए (ii) 81-82 (iii) 238240 (iv) 246240 (v) 138285 (vi) 138285

(34) श्री पी.एल. राजन, कोडुवापुर (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 309000 (iv) 311000 (v) 183728 (vi) 183728

(35) श्री एम.ए. मसीर, मेनेस एम.ए. उदिरुट्टी, कोयिकोट (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 1,04,930 (iv) 280570 (v) 2,57,83 (vi) 47061

(36) श्री टी.जी. बेगोय, मानिटी एडमिटेड स्टोर्स एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 331670 (iv) 331690 (v) 196723 (vi) 196723

(37) श्री टी.जी. बेगोय, मानिटी एडमिटेड स्टोर्स, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 373680 (iv) 430330 (v) 267551 (vi) 265398

(38) श्री टी.जी. बेगोय, मानिटी एडमिटेड स्टोर्स, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 381510 (iv) 391530 (v) 221915 (vi) 216557

(39) श्री सूर्यकांत के. मेहता, मेनेस सी. के. एन. मेहता एड को., कोबन-2 (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 224250 (iv) 225320 (v) 126519 (vi) 126519

(40) श्री ए.न. शिमानन, मद्रास म्पुमाकॉड एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 288510 (iv) 249300 (v) 171172 (vi) 145823

(41) श्री ए.एन. विरमलकन्नन, हिन्दुस्तान मार्टिने, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 206390 (iv) 207900 (v) 106419 (vi) 106419

(42) श्रीमती वनमाली एम.पी. दोन्नी टेम्बेन्, कणूर (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 2,22,470 (iv) 2,22,470 (v) 113227 (vi) 113227

(43) श्री के.ए. जकटिग (i) ए (ii) 84-85 (iii) 177230 (iv) 209030 (v) 125261 (vi) 125261

#### अनुसूची 1वीं

(1) मोरिस डार्डेरेय, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 976010 (iv) 1091110 (v) 280199 (vi) 277721

(2) मेनेस जयन्ती मिस्त्र एड नगर, एरणाकुलम (i) ए (ii) 85-86 (iii) 1304090 (iv) 1530000 (v) 425163 (vi) 425163

(3) जोरमोनि लिम्बेन्, कालिल्ल (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 128440 (iv) 1047410 (v) 271676 (vi) 80510

(4) मेनेस कनकोन कुंरी टेम्बेन्, गार बाब रोड, कोयिकोट (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 203380 (iv) 1003380 (v) 357353 (vi) 38292

(5) कोणमगम लिम्बेन्, कोनारन (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 72580 (iv) 1153890 (v) 282352 (vi) —

(6) मेनेस सी.पी. लायल एड म्पु, कणूर (i) ए (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 1349790 (iv) 1348290 (v) 340549 (vi) 340230

(7) ए. आनन गानर कलर मनेन्दु, कणूर (i) ए (ii) 83-85 (iii) 1237480 (iv) 1243550 (v) 320009 (vi) 320009

(8) पूवन् पारी एड म्पु, कोबन (i) ए (ii) 83-84 (iii) 971620 (iv) 1017680 (v) 253275 (vi) 253337

- (9) मेमेस एम. ए. उषाकिशोरी, चेन्नई राइट, कोयिकोट (i) एक  
(ii) 83-94 (iii) 317310 (iv) 1085130 (v) 416639  
(vi) 69000

## भाग II

## शून्य

## अनुसूची III

- (1) श्री पी. ए. अच्युत सनीर, डायर आर. ए. पञ्चुव रत्तिमावुट्टी  
एंड सण, कोचीन, 1 (i) 136000 (ii) — (iii) 136000
- (2) श्री अच्युता मोहम्मद कल्लंगाडी, कमरगाड (i) 116497 (ii)  
32296 (iii) 148793
- (3) श्री अटोण्टी, मेमर्स आगन किगरीन, कोचीन 6 (i) 448000  
(ii) 22000 (iii) 47000
- (4) स्व. श्री के. जे. कोलंबस, मेमर्स आगन किगरीन, कोचीन-6  
(i) 762000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 762000
- (5) श्री के. ए. हंसोबा टुडका मर्वेट, कोचीन 2 (i) 300000  
(ii) 69000 (iii) 459000
- (6) स्व. श्री ए. पी. मोहम्मद हाजी, कोबिक्कोट (i) 577989  
(ii) 111648 (iii) 689637
- (7) मेमर्स आगन किगरीन, कोचीन 6 (i) 1167000 (ii) शून्य  
(iii) 1167000
- (8) श्री बी. आर. परेश, कनवेडी, कोचीन 1 (i) 560000 (ii)  
59000 (iii) 619000
- (9) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 6331 (ii) — (iii) 6331
- (10) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 2753 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2753
- (11) मेमेस एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 4484 (ii) शून्य (iii) 4484
- (12) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 10500 (ii) शून्य (iii) 10500
- (13) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 66677 (ii) शून्य (iii) 66677
- (14) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 65 (ii) शून्य (iii) 65
- (15) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 7311 (ii) शून्य (iii) 7311
- (16) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 10725 (ii) शून्य (iii) 10725
- (17) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 949 (ii) शून्य (iii) 949
- (18) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(ii) 13188 (ii) शून्य (iii) 13188
- (19) मेमेस एम. एम. एम. सानिहीन साहिब एंड ब्रदर्स, कोडुवायूर  
(i) 4059 (ii) शून्य (iii) 4059
- (20) श्री सी. सुभाष चंद्र कम्मर ज्वनर, ओरामपेट, कामरगोड  
(i) 128783 (ii) शून्य (iii) 128783
- (21) श्री बेगुगोतावर्म राजा, कोन्नकोड (i) 196 (ii) शून्य  
(iii) 196
- (22) -वही- (i) 1896 (ii) शून्य (iii) 1896
- (23) -वही- (i) 2100 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2100
- (24) -वही- (i) 2460 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2460

- (25) -वही- (i) 2000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2000
- (26) -वही- (i) 2000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2000
- (27) -वही- (i) 2000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 20000
- (28) -वही- (i) 2000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2000
- (29) -वही- (i) 2110 (ii) शून्य (iii) 2349
- (30) -वही- (i) 7420 (ii) शून्य (iii) 7420
- (31) -वही- (i) 7137 (ii) शून्य (iii) 7130
- (32) -वही- (i) 6020 (ii) शून्य (iii) 6020
- (33) -वही- (i) 6020 (ii) शून्य (iii) 6020
- (34) -वही- (i) 48321 (ii) शून्य (iii) 48321
- (35) -वही- (i) 109133 (ii) शून्य (iii) 109133
- (36) -वही- (i) 109133 (ii) शून्य (iii) 109133
- (37) -वही- (i) 56196 (ii) शून्य (iii) 56196
- (38) -वही- (i) 50909 (ii) शून्य (iii) 50909
- (39) -वही- (i) 47584 (ii) शून्य (iii) 47584
- (40) -वही- (i) 32938 (ii) शून्य (iii) 32938
- (41) -वही- (i) 37000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 37000
- (42) -वही- (i) 37000 (ii) शून्य (iii) 37000
- (43) श्री बेगुगोतावर्म राजा, कोन्नकोड, (i) 37000 (ii)  
शून्य (iii) 37000
- (44) -वही- (i) 9525 (ii) शून्य (iii) 9525
- (45) -वही- (i) 9525 (ii) शून्य (iii) 9525

ह.

(एम. जे. न. 11)

काश्मिर आनकर आयुक्त

सी. कार्तिकेयन नायर, आयुक्त अधिकारी

S.O. 1673.—Pursuant to the direction of the Government of India under section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, conveyed by the Department of Revenue (Central Board of Direct Taxes), the Commissioner of Income-tax, Cochin, hereby publishes the following information with references to the financial year 1985-86.

Schedule-I.A. Contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of individuals and Hindu Undivided Families assessed on an income of more than Rs. 2 lakhs.

Schedule-I.B. contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of Companies, Firms and Associations of persons assessed on an income of more than Rs. 10 lakhs.

Schedule-II. contains names, addresses and other particulars in respect of persons on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5000 was imposed during the financial year 1985-86 for failure to file a return of income in time or to produce books of account, or for concealment of income, or in whose cases such penalties have been confirmed in appeal or revision during the financial year 1985-86, to an extent of Rs. 5000 or more.

Schedule-III. contains the names, addresses and other particulars in respect of persons who have been in default of payment of tax, amounting to Rs. 1 lakh or more, for over two years as on the last day of the financial year 1985-86.

2. The particulars given in Schedule-I.A and Schedule-I.B are (i) Status (ii) assessment year (iii) income returned (iv) income assessed (v) income-tax payable and (vi) income-tax paid.

The particulars given in Schedule II are (i) status (ii) assessment year (iii) amount of penalty (iv) nature of penalty.

The particulars given in Schedule III are (i) tax including interest (ii) penalty and (iii) total (all amounts are in rupees).

3. Status is indicated by 'I' for individual, 'H.U.F.' for Hindu Undivided Families, 'Co' for Companies 'F' for Firms 'A.O.P.' for Association of Persons and 'R' for representative assesses.

## Schedule-IA :

1. Sri Abdul Hazeeb Chowghat (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 5,34,570 (iv) 5,44,010 (v) 3,47,357 (vi) 3,47,357.
2. Sri A. Abdul Rawoof, Chowghat (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 10,32,450 (iv) 10,33,320 (v) 6,79,507 (vi) 6,79,507.
3. Sri A. Abdul Shafieque, Chowghat (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 5,51,030 (iv) 5,52,220 (v) 3,52,898 (vi) 3,52,898.
4. Sri K. R. Aboobacker, Ponnani (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,09,811 (iv) 2,15,420 (v) 1,19,985 (vi) 1,19,985.
5. Sri C. L. Anand, Toshiba Anand Batteries, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,50,120 (iv) 2,50,120 (v) 1,20,192 (vi) 1,20,192.
6. Smt. Annie Paul, Kadayiruppu (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 3,59,280 (iv) 3,59,280 (v) 2,01,464 (vi) 2,01,464.
7. Mrs. Catherine Palu, Chakola Bhavan, Trichur (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,68,570 (iv) 3,68,200 (v) 2,20,820 (vi) 2,20,820.
8. Sri C. Chacko (i) I (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 2,42,760 (iv) 2,54,390 (v) 1,51,947 (vi) 1,04,180.
9. Sri C. Chacko (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,17,400 (iv) 2,38,370 (v) 1,39,834 (vi) 1,00,315.
10. Sri M. Chacko Pillai, Kolenchery (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 2,25,830 (iv) 2,27,060 (v) 1,32,313 (vi) 1,32,313.
11. Sri K. Chellan, Elanthiankode (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,01,200 (iv) 3,01,200 (v) 1,76,606 (vi) 1,76,606.
12. Sri Dilipkumar K. Metha, M/s. C.K.N. Mehta & Co., Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,12,460 (iv) 2,14,660 (v) 1,19,489 (vi) 1,19,489.
13. Sri K. Divakara Shenoy, M/s. K.V.N. Shenoy & Co., Cannanore (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,42,890 (iv) 2,43,220 (v) 1,38,333 (vi) 1,38,333.
14. Sri K. P. Nelson, Nelson Trust, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1982-83 (iii) 2,11,880 (iv) 2,11,880 (v) 1,94,199 (vi) 1,94,199.
15. Sri K. P. Nelson, Nelson Trust, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,36,460 (iv) 2,66,070 (v) 2,46,668 (vi) 2,46,668.
16. Dr. A. Geetha, 1/60, Beach Road, Calicut (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 57,260 (iv) 2,30,170 (v) 1,70,955 (vi) 19,893.
17. Sri K. P. Gopalan, Kumaranelloor (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 10,60,810 (iv) 10,63,810 (v) 6,36,014 (vi) 6,36,014.
18. Sri A. P. Hamza Koya, Pandarathoppu, Paramba, Kundungal, Calicut-3 (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,95,000 (iv) 3,00,000 (v) 1,63,406 (vi) 1,63,406.
19. Sri M. C. Jacob (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 2,74,150 (iv) 3,06,740 (v) 1,90,315 (vi) 1,90,315.
20. Sri Jayaprakash G. H., Mamananda Oil & Flour Mills, Cannanore (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,03,610 (iv) 2,03,610 (v) 1,01,991 (vi) 1,01,991.
21. Smt. P. Karthiyani Amma, Irinjalakuda (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,96,650 (iv) 4,15,490 (v) 2,52,031 (vi) 2,52,031.
22. Sri T. T. Kunjappan, Kothamangalam (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,95,340 (iv) 2,95,340 (v) 1,60,647 (vi) 1,60,647.
23. Sri K. Kunhiraman, Cannanore (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,91,510 (iv) 2,91,510 (v) 1,58,154 (vi) 1,58,154.
24. Sri P. Kurain, Advocate, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,10,570 (iv) 2,18,080 (v) 1,21,740 (vi) 1,21,740.
25. Sri Mahendrakumar K. Mehta, C/o. C. K. N. Mehta & Co., Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,11,170 (iv) 2,11,600 (v) 1,17,464 (vi) 1,17,464.
26. Smt. K. P. Mary, Kadayiruppu (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 3,67,340 (iv) 3,67,340 (v) 2,06,451 (vi) 2,06,451.
27. Sri M. A. Mathew (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 2,11,820 (iv) 2,59,110 (v) 1,64,746 (vi) 1,64,746.
28. Sri Nalin D. Sampath, M/s. Sampth Enterprises, Copra Bazaar, Calicut (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 7,23, (iv) 7,38,620 (v) 4,44,129 (vi) 4,25,515.
29. Sri S. S. Narayanan, Preeethi, Chittoor Road, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,70,530 (iv) 3,68,530 (v) 2,22,040 (vi) 2,22,040.
30. Sri S. S. Narayanan, do- (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 3,66,300 (iv) 3,66,300 (v) 2,24,331 (vi) 2,24,331.
31. Smt. K. Padmavathy Kovilamma (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 1,54,560 (iv) 2,43,960 (v) 1,41,751 (vi) 1,41,751.
32. Sri P. M. Paily Pillai, Kolenchery (i) I (ii) 1980-81 (iii) 2,01,010 (iv) 2,07,010 (v) 1,23,007 (vi) 1,23,007.
33. Sri P. M. Paily Pillai, Kolenchery (i) I (ii) 1981-82 (iii) 2,38,240 (iv) 2,46,240 (v) 1,38,285 (vi) 1,38,285.
34. Sri P. S. Rajan, Koduvayur (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,09,000 (iv) 3,14,000 (v) 1,83,728 (vi) 1,83,728.
35. Sri M. A. Sajeev, M/s. M. A. Unnengrikutty, Calicut (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 1,04,930 (iv) 2,80,570 (v) 2,57,183 (vi) 47,061.
36. Sri T. G. Shenoy, Sanitary Equipment Stores, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,31,670 (iv) 3,31,690 (v) 1,96,723 (vi) 1,96,723.
37. Sri T. G. Shenoy, Sanitary Equipment Stores, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 3,37,880 (iv) 40,30,330 (v) 2,67,551 (vi) 2,65,398.
38. Sri T. G. Shenoy, Sanitary Equipment Stores, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 3,81,510 (iv) 3,94,560 (v) 2,21,915 (vi) 2,16,557.
39. Sri Suryakant K. Mehta, M/s. C.K.N. Mehta & Co., Cochin-2 (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,24,250 (iv) 2,25,320 (v) 1,26,519 (vi) 1,26,519.
40. Sri L. Sivanadan, Maharaja Super Market, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 2,88,510 (iv) 2,49,300 (v) 1,74,172 (vi) 1,45,823.
41. Sri A. N. Viswanatha Kamath, Hindustan Hardwares, Ernakulam (i) I (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 2,06,390 (iv) 2,07,900 (v) 1,06,419 (vi) 1,06,419.
42. Smt. Vanajakshi M.P. Decpti Textiles, Cannanore (i) I (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,22,470 (iv) 2,22,470 (v) 1,13,227 (vi) 1,13,227.
43. Sri K. A. Zacharia (i) I (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 1,77,230 (iv) 2,09,030 (v) 1,25,261 (vi) 1,25,261.

## Schedule-IB

1. M/s. Gosris Hardwares, Ernakulam (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 9,76,040 (iv) 10,91,110 (v) 2,80,199 (vi) 2,77,721.
2. M/s. Jayalakshmi Silk and Sarces, Ernakulam (i) F (ii) 1985-86 (iii) 15,04,090 (iv) 15,30,000 (v) 4,25,163 (vi) 4,25,163.
3. M/s. Jeevjayothi Liquors, Kadalikad (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 1,28,440 (iv) 10,87,410 (v) 2,71,676 (vi) 80,510.
4. M/s. Kalkoth Kunhi Timbers, South Beach Road, Calicut (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 2,03,380 (iv) 10,03,380 (v) 3,57,353 (vi) 38,292.
5. M/s. Kothamangalam Liquors, Kothamangalam (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 72,580 (iv) 11,53,890 (v) 2,82,352 (vi) —.
6. M/s. C. P. Lonappan and sons, Trichur (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 13,49,790 (iv) 13,48,290 (v) 3,40,230.
7. M/s. New Anand Sagar, Colour Merchants, Cannanore (i) F (ii) 1984-85 (iii) 12,37,480 (iv) 12,43,550 (v) 3,20,009 (vi) 3,20,009.

8. M/s. Poovath Paray and Sons, Cochin (i) F (ii) 1981-84 (iii) 9,71,620 (iv) 10,17,680 (v) 2,53,276 (vi) 2,53,367.
9. M/s. M. A. Unneerikutty, Cherooty Road, Calicut (i) F (ii) 1983-84 (iii) 3,17,310 (iv) 10,85,130 (v) 4,16,639 (vi) 69,000.

## Schedule-II

Nil.

## Schedule-III

1. Sri P. A. Abdul Majeed, C/o R. A. Abdul Rahimankutty and Sons, Cochin-1 (i) 1,36,000 (ii) nil (iii) 1,36,000.
2. Sri Abdulla Mohammed, Kallangadi, Kasaragod (i) 1,16,497 (ii) 32,296 (iii) 1,48,793.
3. Sri Antonitto, M/s. Ocean Fisheries, Cochin-6 (i) 4,48,000 (ii) 22,000 (iii) 4,70,000.
4. Late Sri K. J. Cluombus, M/s. Ocean Fisheries, Cochin-6 (i) 7,62,000 (ii) nil (iii) 7,62,000.
5. Sri K. A. Hamsa Koya, Tobacco Merchant, Cochin-2 (i) 3,90,000 (ii) 69,000 (iii) 4,59,000.
6. Late Sri A. P. Mohammed Haji, Calicut (i) 5,77,989 (ii) 1,11,648 (iii) 6,89,637.
7. M/s. Ocean Fisheries, Cochin-6 (i) 11,67,000 (ii) nil (iii) 11,67,000.
8. Sri V. R. Parekh, Calvetty, Cochin-1 (i) 5,60,000 (ii) 59,000 (iii) 6,19,000.
9. M/s. M. S. M. Saliheen Sahib and Bros., Koduvayur (i) 1,27,042 (ii) nil (iii) 1,27,042.
10. Sri C. Subash Chandra Kamath, Jeweller Sirampet, Kasaragod (i) 1,28,783 (ii) nil (iii) 1,28,783.
11. Sri Venugopala Varma Raja, Kollengode (i) 6,28,346 (ii) nil (iii) 6,28,346.

Sd/-

(M. J. MATHAN)

Commissioner of Income tax, Cochin.

C. KARTHIKEYAN NAIR, Income Tax Officer (R)

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1987

का.आ. 1674—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रिय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम 1965 के नियम 31 के साथ पठित नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उपनियम (2) के खंड (ख) और नियम 24 के उपनियम (1) द्वारा प्रदान शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, वित्त मन्त्रालय (व्यय विभाग) को अधिसूचना सं. का. नि. आ. 639, तारीख 25 फरवरी, 1957 का निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करने हे. अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में, माध्याम्य केन्द्रीय सेवा समूह "अ" में संश्लिष्ट भाग-1 में—

(क) "नियंत्रक और महालेखा परीक्षक के अधीनस्थ सभी लेखा और लेखा परीक्षक कार्यालय" शब्दों के नीचे, स्वच्छ 1 में, "महायक लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी" प्रविष्टि के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि अन्तःस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात्—  
"वरिष्ठ निजी महायक";

(ख) "भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा और लेखा सेवा कर्मचारी महा-विद्यालय" शब्दों के नीचे, स्वच्छ 1 में, "महायक लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी" प्रविष्टि के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि अन्तःस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात्—  
"वरिष्ठ निजी महायक"

[का.सं.सी-11021/3/86-ई जी.]

डी. त्यागेश्वरन, असुर सचिव

टिप्पण—सब अधिसूचना का.नि.आ. 639, तारीख 25-2-1957 की अनुसूची, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 22-12-1979 में प्रकाशित का.आ. 4049, तारीख 10-12-1979 द्वारा प्रतिस्थापित की गई थी। उक्त निम्नलिखित द्वारा और संशोधन किए गए,—

- (1) भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 18-2-1984 में प्रकाशित का.आ. 506, तारीख 6-2-1984, और
- (2) भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 6-10-1984 में प्रकाशित का.आ. 3145, तारीख 19-9-1984।

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1987

S.O. 1674.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9 clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 read with rule 34 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1955, the President hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) No. S.R.O. 639, dated the 25th February, 1957, namely :—

In the Schedule to the said notification, in part-I relating to General Central Service Group 'B'.

(a) under the heading "All Accounts and Audit Offices subordinate to the Comptroller and Auditor General" in column 1, after the entry "Assistant Audit Officer", the following entry shall be inserted namely :—

"Senior Personal Assistant";

(b) under the heading "Indian Audit and Accounts Service Staff College", in column 1, after the entry "Assistant Audit Officer", the following entry shall be inserted, namely :—

"Senior Personal Assistant".

[F. No. C-11021/3/86-E.G.]

D. THYAGESWARAN Under Secy.

Note.—The Schedule to the original notification S.R.O. 639 dated 28-2-1957 was substituted by S.O. 4049 dated 10-12-1979 published in the Gazette of India Dated 22-12-1979 in Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) and was further amended by —

- (1) S.O. 506 dated 6-2-1984 published in the Gazette of India Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated 18-2-1984 and
- (2) S.O. No. 3145 dated 19-9-1984 published in the Gazette of India, Part-II Section 3 sub-section (ii) dated 6-10-1984.

अधिक कार्य विभाग

(वैकिंग पत्राग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1987

का.आ. 1675—प्रादेशिक वित्त अधिकारियों के अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा 2 द्वारा प्रदान शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री तारागण वहेरा को जिनकी धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के तहत अधिभूक्त ग्राम्य बैंक, बेहरामपुर (उड़ीसा) के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त की गयी थी की पहली अवधि 30-4-1987 को समाप्त हो गई है, 1-5-1987 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-4-1988 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये उक्त बैंक का पुन. अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या एफ. 2-88/82-प्रार.प्रार. बी.]

(Department of Economic Affairs)  
(Banking Division)

तारीख, 19 जून, 1987

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1987

S.O. 1675.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby re-appoints Shri Narayan Vehera whose earlier tenure of three years appointment under sub-section (1) of section 11 had expired on 30-4-87 as the Chairman of Rushikulya Gramya Bank, Berhampur (Orissa) for a further period commencing from 1-5-1987 and ending with 30-4-1988.

[No. F. 2-88/82-RRB]

क्र.सं. 1676—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री के.के. अग्रवाल की बरती ग्रामीण बैंक, बरनी (उत्तर प्रदेश) को अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 18-12-86 से प्रारम्भ होकर 31-12-89 को समाप्त होत वाला अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करने है जिसके दौरान श्री के.के. अग्रवाल अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[संख्या एक. 2-31/86—प्रार. धार. श्री]  
प्रधान कुमार तेजप्रान, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 1676.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Agarwal as the Chairman of the Basti Gramin Bank, Basti (U.P.) and specifies the period commencing on the 18-12-86 and ending with the 31-12-89 as the period for which the said Shri K. K. Agarwal shall hold office as Chairman.

[No. F. 2-31/86-RRB]  
P. K. TIJJYAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1987

S.O. 1676 In pursuance of sub-clause (g) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints with effect from 22-6-1987 the persons specified in column (2) of the Table below as Directors of the nationalised banks specified in column (1) thereof in place of the persons specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table :

TABLE

(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Allahabad Bank	Shri B. K. Basu, Manager, Reserve Bank of India, Nagpur.	Shri O.P. Taneja.
2. Indian Bank	Shri V. Subramanyam, Joint Chief Officer, Department of Banking Operations and Development, Reserve Bank of India, Calcutta.	Dr. S.R.K. Rao
3. Dena Bank	Shri Augustine P. Kurias, Principal, CAB, Reserve Bank of India, Pune.	Shri S.K. Kapur.

[No. F. 9/4/87-BO.I(i)]

क्र. सं. 1677 राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपग्रह) (स्कीम 1970 के खंड 3 का उपबन्ध (घ)) के अनुसार में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिनांक 22 जून, 1987 से नये की मांगी के काम (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों का अपने में प्रत्येक के मामले उनी मांगी के काम (3) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों के स्थान पर मांगी के काम (1) में दिए गए राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करने है -

मांगी

1	2	3
1. इलाहाबाद बैंक	श्री बी. के. बासु प्रबंधक भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक नागपुर	श्री ए. पी. तनेजा
2. इंडियन बैंक	श्री वी. सुब्रमणियम संयुक्त मुख्याधिकारी भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक, डीबीओडी, कलकत्ता	डा. एस. आर. के. राव
3. देना बैंक	श्री ऑगस्टीन पी. कुरियास प्रिंसिपल, सी. ए. बी. भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक, पुणे	श्री ए. ए. के. कपूर

[संख्या एक 9/4/87 - बी. ओ. 1 (1)]



का. प्रा. 1678.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) योजना, 1980 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (छ) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दिनांक 22 जून, 1987 से कुमारी आई. जी. बाज, महाप्रबंधक, निक्षेप बीमा और प्रत्यय गारंटी निगम, बंबई को श्री ए. मोमताबशावा के स्थान पर एतद्वारा ओरियंटल बैंक आफ कामर्स के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या एक. 9/4/87-बी.ओ.-1(2)]

एम. एस. सोतारामन, प्रवर सचिव

S.O. 1678.—In pursuance of sub-clause (g) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1980, the Central Government hereby appoints with effect from 22-6-1987 Miss I. T. Vaz, General Manager, Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation, Bombay as a Director of Oriental Bank of Commerce vice Shri G. A. Bhimnathwala.

[No. F. 9/4/87-BO. I(ii)]

M. S. SEETHARAMAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1987

का. प्रा. 1679.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के प्रावधान जामनगर जिला सहकारी बैंक लिमिटेड, जामनगर (गुजरात) पर इस अधिसूचना के सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 जून 1988 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[एफ. सं. 8-1/87 ए. सी.]

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1987

S.O. 1679.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of sub-section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Jamnagar District Co-operative Bank Ltd., Jamnagar, Gujarat from the date of publication of this notification in the official Gazette to 30 June, 1988.

[F. No. 8-1/87-AC]

का. प्रा. 1680.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा 1 के प्रावधान चित्रदुर्ग जिला सहकारी केन्द्रीय बैंक लिमिटेड, चित्रदुर्ग कर्नाटक पर इस अधिसूचना के सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 जून, 1989 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[एफ. सं. 8-1/87-ए. सी.]

के. पी. पण्डियन, प्रवर सचिव

S.O. 1680.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949) the Central Government on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India declares that the provisions of sub-section 1 of Section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Chitradurga District Cooperative Central Bank Ltd., Chitradurga, Karnataka from the date of publication in the official Gazette to 30 June 1989.

[F. No. 8-1/87-AC]

K. P. PANDIAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली 23, जून, 1987

का. प्रा. 1681.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1980 के खंड 7 के साथ पठित खंड 5 के उपखंड (1) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् श्री पी.एस. गोपालकृष्णन को, जिन्हें 20 अप्रैल, 1987 से ओरियंटल बैंक आफ कामर्स के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में पुनः नियुक्त किया गया है, उसी तारीख से ओरियंटल बैंक आफ कामर्स के निदेशक बॉर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 9/14/87-बी.ओ.-1(2)]

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1987

S.O. 1681.—In pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause 5, read with clause 7 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India hereby appoints Shri P. S. Gopalakrishnan who has been re-appointed as Managing Director of Oriental Bank of Commerce with effect from April 26, 1987 to be the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Oriental Bank of Commerce with effect from the same date.

[No. F. 9/15/87-BO.I(2)]

का. प्रा. 1682.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खंड 8 के उपखंड (1) के साथ पठित खंड 3 के उपखंड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् श्री मार श्रीनिवासन को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से और 29 मई, 1991 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एक. 9/11/87-बी.ओ. I(1)]

S.O. 1682.—In pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause 3 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri R. Srinivasan as the Managing Director of Bank of India for a period commencing with the date of his taking charge and ending with May 29, 1991.

[No. F. 9/11/87-BO. I(1)]

का. प्रा. 1683.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1980 के खंड 8 के उपखंड (1) के साथ पठित खंड 3 के उपखंड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् श्री पी.एस. गोपालकृष्णन को 26 अप्रैल, 1987 से कार्यभार होने वाली और 25 अप्रैल, 1992 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए ओरियंटल बैंक आफ कामर्स के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में पुनः नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या एक. 9/15/87-बी.ओ.-I(1)]

S.O. 1683.—In pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause 3 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1980 the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby re-appoints Shri P. S. Gopalakrishnan as the Managing Director of Oriental Bank of Commerce for a period commencing on April 26, 1987 and ending with April 25, 1992.

[No. F. 9/15/87-BO I(1)]

का. प्रा. 1684.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खंड 7 के साथ पठित खंड 5 के उपखंड (1) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् श्री मार श्रीनिवासन को, जिन्हें कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया है, उसी तारीख से बैंक आफ इंडिया के निदेशक बॉर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एक. 9/11/87-बी.ओ. I(2)]

एस.एस. हसूरकर, निदेशक

S.O. 1684.—In pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause 5 read with clause 7, of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri R. Srinivasan who has been appointed as Managing Director of Bank of India from the date of his taking charge to be the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Bank of India with effect from the same date.

[No. F. 9/11/87-BO.I(2)]

S. S. HASURKAR, Director

### वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1987.]

आदेश

का.आ. 1685.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक और समीचीन है कि पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा का निर्यात से पूर्व क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण किया जाए।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट प्रस्ताव बनाए है और उन्हें निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उपनियम (2) की प्रस्तावानुसार भारतीय निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् को भेज दिया है;

अतः, अब, उक्त उपनियम के अनुवर्ण में और भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 48 तारीख 3 जनवरी, 1981 को जो भारत के राजपत्र भाग-2, खंड-3, उपखंड-(ii) तारीख 3 जनवरी, 1981 में प्रकाशन की गई थी, अधिकांत करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त प्रस्तावों को उक्त नियमों की जातकारी के लिए प्रकाशित करती है जिनके उनसे प्रभावित होने को संभावना है।

2 यह सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रस्तावों के बारे में यदि कोई व्यक्ति कोई आप्रति या सुझाव देना चाहता है तो वह उन्हें इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से पैंतालीस दिन के भीतर, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, 11वीं मंजिल, प्रगति टावर, 26 राबर्ट्स प्लेस, नई दिल्ली-110008 को भेज सकता है।

प्रस्ताव

(1) यह अधिसूचित करना कि पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा निर्यात से पूर्व क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के अधीन हों;

(2) क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के ऐसे प्रकार का विनिर्दिष्ट करना जो इस आदेश के उपाबंध I में दिए गए पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़े के निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम के 1980 के प्रावधान के अनुसार क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के प्रकार के हों और जो निर्यात से पूर्व ऐसे पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा को लागू हों;

(3) (i) राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मानकों का मान्यता देना; और

(ii) केता और क्रिस्ता के बीच किए गए हथार के ऐसे सविदात्मक विनिर्देशों को जो उपाबंध II में विनिर्दिष्ट स्पूतन विनिर्देशों के अधीन रहते हुए ऐसे पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़े के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों के रूप में क्रमिक श्रेणी के लिए हो मान्यता देना;

(4) अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के अनुक्रम में ऐसे पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़े के निर्यात का प्रतिषिद्ध करना जब तक उसके प्रत्येक परिवर्ण के साथ निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) का धारा के अधीन स्थापित अधिकारों में से किसी एक के द्वारा जारी किया गया है आग्रह का निरीक्षण प्रमाण-पत्र न हो कि

पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण से संबंधित शर्तों को पूरा करते हैं, और वे निर्यात योग्य हैं।

2 इस आदेश को कोई भी बात भावी केताओं को भूमी, बाग या समुद्री मार्ग द्वारा पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ों के उन वास्तविक नमूनों के निर्यात को लागू नहीं होगी जिनका पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य 500 रु. से अधिक नहीं हो।

3 इस आदेश के "पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा" से करास, जूट, रेयोन, नायलोन, या अन्य किसी संश्लिष्ट से बना ऐसा कृत्रिम अभिप्रेत है जिस पर समश्रित विनिर्देश क्लोराइड, पालिडर या कोम्पाजिडर की उपयुक्त परत एक ओर या दोनों ओर कोटिंग या आच्छादित द्वारा की लगाई गई हो।

उपाबंध।

निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 के अधीन बनाए जाने वाले नियमों का प्रस्तावित प्रावधान—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ:—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ा निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1987 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. परिभाषाएं:—इन नियमों में जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हों:—

(क) "अधिनियम" से निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अभिप्रेत है;

(ख) "अधिकरण" से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन मुम्बई, कलकत्ता, कोच्चीन, दिल्ली और मद्रास में स्थापित अधिकारणों में से कोई अधिकरण अभिप्रेत है;

(ग) "अनुसूचि युनिट" से अधिकरण द्वारा अनुमोदित ऐसी विनिर्माण युनिट अभिप्रेत जिनमें उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण की प्रवेक्षाओं को पूरा कर दिया है;

(घ) "परिवर्ण धार निरीक्षण" से यह व्यवहारित करने की प्रक्रिया अभिप्रेत है कि नया निर्यात के लिए प्राग्विक पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़े का परिवर्ण, परिषद् द्वारा अधिकृत रीति से अधिकरण द्वारा निरीक्षण और परीक्षण द्वारा मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुक्रम है;

(ङ) "परिषद्" से अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषदों में से कोई परिषद् अभिप्रेत है;

(च) "उत्तरान के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण" (इसके पश्चात् इसे आई.पी.क्यू.सी. भी कहा गया है) से ऐसा क्वालिटी नियंत्रण की पद्धति अभिप्रेत है जिसके द्वारा विनिर्माण युनिट यह सुनिश्चित करती है कि पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़ों के संघटक भागों और संयंत्रों के कट, विनिर्माण, निरीक्षण, परिवर्ण और परिवर्ण के विभिन्न प्रकार पर नियंत्रणों का प्रयोग करके हुए मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुक्रम परिषद् द्वारा अधिकृत रीति से विनिर्माण किए गए हैं।

(छ) "पी.बी.सी. चर्मे कपड़े" से करास, जूट, रेयोन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी कृत्रिम कृत्रिम से बनाया गया ऐसा कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिस पर समश्रित विनिर्देश क्लोराइड पालिडर की उपयुक्त परत एक ओर या दोनों ओर कोटिंग या आच्छादित द्वारा लगाई हो।

(ज) "कालिक निरीक्षण" से अनुमोदित यूनिट में अभिकरण के अधिकारियों द्वारा समय-समय पर उत्पाद के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण प्रोत्साहनों को प्रोत्साहित करने के लिए किया गया निरीक्षण अभियान है और

(1) "स्वन पर जांच" से अनिवार्य तौर पर निरीक्षण का निरीक्षण अभियान है जिससे कि परिवर्तन द्वारा अधिकृत रीति से मानक विनिर्देशों का अनुपालन सुनिश्चित हो सके।

3. निरीक्षण का आधार—(1) निर्यात के लिए अनामतित पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों का निरीक्षण हल यूनिट से किया जाता कि वह अधिनियम की धारा 6 के प्रथम केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यता प्राप्त मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप हों;

(क) अधिनियम (2) के अनुसार अनुमोदित यूनिट द्वारा प्रयुक्त उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण के आधार पर;

या

(ख) परेवण बार निरीक्षण के आधार पर;

या

(ग) दोनों द्वारा।

(2) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण—(1) अपने द्वारा विनिर्मित पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों का निर्यात करने के लिए आशयित कोई भी विनिर्माण यूनिट और जिसके पास पर्याप्त क्वालिटी नियंत्रण (आई.पी.क्यू.सी.) है, अभिकरण को उन्हीं आशय को सूचित करके हुए क्वालिटी नियंत्रण (आई.पी.क्यू.सी.) के अंतर्गत अनुमोदन प्राप्त करने के लिए आवेदन करेगी।

(2) अनुमोदित यूनिट द्वारा प्रयोग में लाई गई उत्पादन के दौरान पर्याप्त क्वालिटी नियंत्रण का निर्वहन करने के लिए अभिकरण व्यवस्था करेगी और यदि उसका संतुष्ट समाधान हो जाता है तो विनिर्माण यूनिट को अनुमोदित यूनिट के रूप में घोषित करेगी।

(3) अपना यह समाधान करने के प्रयोजन के लिए कि अनुमोदन यूनिट द्वारा अनिवार्य उत्पादों के दौरान नियंत्रण जारी है, अभिकरण कालिक निरीक्षण और स्थान पर जांच करेगी।

(2) उत्पादन के दौरान, क्वालिटी नियंत्रण (आई.पी.क्यू.सी.) के अधीन यूनिट को दिया गया अनुमोदन इस संबंध में परिषद द्वारा अधिकृत मामलों के अनुसार, कम से कम सात दिन की सूचना देने के पश्चात् अभिकरण द्वारा वापस के लिया जाएगा।

(3) ऐसा यूनिट जिसका अनुमोदन वापस ले लिया गया है, कमियों को परिशोधित के पश्चात् पुनः अनुमोदन के लिए अभिकरण को नया आवेदन कर सकेगी।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया—(1) पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों के परेवण का निर्यात करने के लिए आशयित कोई निर्यातकर्ता, निरीक्षण के लिए अभिकरण को ऐसा करने के अपने आशय की सूचना लिखित रूप में परेवण के भेजे जाने के कम से कम सात दिन पूर्व प्रस्तुत करेगा जिससे कि अभिकरण नियम—(3) और परिवर्तन द्वारा अधिकृत प्रक्रिया के अनुसार परेवण का निरीक्षण करने में समर्थ हो सके।

(2) अभिकरण अपना या समाधान करने से परेवण अधिनियम की अपेक्षाओं और मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है, सूचना की प्राप्ति के सात दिन के भीतर निर्यात के लिए निरीक्षण प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करेगा, परन्तु जहाँ अभिकरण का ऐसा समाधान नहीं होता है वहाँ वह उक्त सात दिन की अवधि के भीतर उसके कारणों सहित लिखित रूप से प्रमाण-पत्र करने से इंकार करे देगा।

(3) प्रमाणकरण के पश्चात्, अभिकरण परेवण का संभार, अभिकरण के दौरान पर पुनः निर्धारण कर सकेगी। यदि परेवण अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप नहीं पाया जाता है तो मूल रूप से जारी किया गया प्रमाण-पत्र वापस ले लिया जाएगा।

5. निरीक्षण का स्थान—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक निरीक्षण,

(क) ऐसे विनिर्माण यूनिटों के परिसर में;

या

(ख) ऐसे परिसरों में किया जाएगा जहाँ निरीक्षण के लिए माल प्रस्तुत किया जाता है, परन्तु यह तब जब वहाँ इस प्रयोजन के लिए पर्याप्त सुविधाएँ विद्यमान हों;

या

(ग) पोतखदान के पत्तन पर, किया जायेगा।

6. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस का संदाय निम्नलिखित रूप में किया जाएगा—

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए, पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम 20/- रु. के अधीन रहते हुए।

(ख) परेवण बार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम 20/- रु. के अधीन रहते हुए।

(2) (क) प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम 20/- रु. के अधीन रहते हुए (क) और (ख) के लिए क्रमशः 0.18 प्रतिशत और 0.38 प्रतिशत की दर से उन निर्यातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघों राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के साथ संधु उद्योग विनिर्माण यूनिटों के लिए रजिस्ट्री-कृत हैं।

7. अपील—(1) नियम 4 के उपनियम (2) के अधीन अभिकरण द्वारा प्रमाण-पत्र देने से इंकार किए जाने से स्पष्ट कि कोई व्यक्ति ऐसे इंकार की सूचना की प्राप्ति होने के वस दिन के भीतर इस प्रयोजन के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त विशेषज्ञों से ऐसे पैनल को अपील कर सकेगा जिसमें पैनल की कुल संख्या के कम से कम दो तिहाई गैर सरकारी संस्य होंगे।

(2) पैनल की गणपूर्ति के लिए संख्या तीन होगी।

(3) पैनल की अपील की प्राप्ति के पन्द्रह दिन के भीतर अपील का निपटारा करेगी।

#### उपाखण्ड—II

पी. बी. सी. चर्म कपड़ों के न्यूनतम विनिर्देश—

##### 1. सामग्री और विनिर्माण

1.1 (विलेपन (क) पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों का विनिर्माण आधारित फैब्रिक पर एक या दोनों और उपयुक्त संमिश्रण विनयल क्लोराइड पॉलिमर या कोम्प्लिमेर को परत द्वारा एक समान विलेपन या आपटोकरण द्वारा किया जाएगा। उनका प्रवर्गीकरण निम्नलिखित रूप में किया जाएगा—

(i) ठोस चर्म कपड़ा: विनयल परत लगी फैब्रिक का विनिर्माण फैब्रिक के एक या दोनों ओर विनयल क्लोराइड या पॉलिमर की उपयुक्त संमिश्रित पॉलिमर की निरंतर विलेपन द्वारा किया जाएगा, जिसका मुख्य घटक विनयल, क्लोराइड है।

(ii) बिस्तारित विनयल परत की लागार्थ फैब्रिक: बिस्तारित विनयल परत लगी हुई फैब्रिक का विनिर्माण फैब्रिक के एक या दोनों

और विनयल क्लोराइड या कोपोलिमर की उपयुक्त सम्मिश्रित पोलिमर की ठोस विलेयन द्वारा किया जाएगा जिसमें विनयल क्लोराइड मुख्य घटक होगा, पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के भाग पर विलेयन फैली होती है।

टिप्पण : बुने हुए या बंधे हुए यथास्थित बेविक फैसिक बुनी हुई या बंधी हुई अनिप्रेत है।

(ख) विलेयन मिश्रण की संरचना तैयार उत्पाद को वांछित रूप और शक्ति देने के लिए होगी।

(ग) विलेयन पैर फुलन, पिन, छिद्रों और अन्य यांत्रिक दोषों से मुक्त होगी। यह बिप-बिपी नहीं होगी और इसमें कोई बुरी लगने वाली गंध नहीं होगी।

टिप्पण : जिल्द बांधन के लिए प्रयोजन के लिए श्रेणी ४ पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ा को दशा में यद्यपि पिन छिद्र दृष्टिगत हो सकते हैं, किन्तु जल प्रवेश अनुज्ञात नहीं होगा।

1.2 आधारीक फैब्रिक : इस प्रयोजन के लिए आधारीक फैब्रिक धातु की क्वालिटी, बनावट और शक्ति का होगा। यह साफ और बुनाई या विनिर्माण संयंघी से मुक्त होगा जिससे अंतिम कोटिंग पर कोई छुट्टि दृष्टिकोण न हो।

## 2. श्रेणी

इसकी चार श्रेणियां होंगी :

श्रेणी	अपेक्षित उपयोग	न्यूनतम कुल भार ग्राम/वर्ग मीटरों में
1. भारी इयूटी	भारी परिवहन, गद्देदार फर्नीचर, सूटकेस और सामान आदि में प्रयुक्त	650
2. मध्यम इयूटी	हल्के परिवहन, गद्देदार फर्नीचर, सूटकेस और सामान आदि में प्रयुक्त	450
3. साईट इयूटी	हल्की बनावट हुई वस्तुओं या चहरो, कार हेड लाईनिंग, दरवाजों और साईड पैनल, जूते आदि में प्रयुक्त	300
4. सामान्य प्रयोजन	जिल्द साजी में (सूती फैब्रिक) वीवार को डकने चहरो, छोटे हैंड बैग, पर्स सजावटी के प्रयोजनों आदि में प्रयुक्त	200

2.1 सामग्री सारणी I में दी गई अपेक्षाओं के अनुषंग होगी। उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रत्येक श्रेणी को या तो बुनी हुई या बंधी हुई बेस फैब्रिक रूप में प्रदाय की जाएगी और उन्हें निम्नलिखित रूप में अभिविष्ट किया जाएगा :—

डब्ल्यू एस	बुना हुआ 'शील्ड' चर्म कपड़ा
डब्ल्यू ई	बुना हुआ "विस्तृत" चर्म कपड़ा
के.एस.	बंधा हुआ 'ठोस' चर्म कपड़ा
के.ई.	बंधा हुआ 'विस्तृत' चर्म कपड़ा

बिन्हाकन : सामग्री को विनिर्माता के नाम या व्यापार चिह्न से यदि कोई हो, श्रेणी और सामग्री का प्रकार, विनिर्माण का वर्ष और मास और सामग्री की लम्बाई को मीटरों में चिह्नित किया जाएगा।

## टिप्पण:

1. जूट या अन्य रंग किरणों टैक्सटाइल फैब्रिक आधारीक चर्म कपड़े के लिए कुल भार वह होगा निर्वातकर्ता द्वारा घोषित रेंज के भीतर हो, किन्तु श्रेणीक से कम नहीं होगा। ताने और बुने की विधा में क्रमशः न्यूनतम टूटन समर्थ्य क्रमशः 90 और 95 कि. ग्रा./5 सें. मीटर होगा। यदि संविधा में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट न किया गया हो। कोटिंग वायु ओवन में 100+2° सें. से. पर 24 घंटों के लिए उद्गम या बिपविपाहट का चिह्नित दांति किए बिना सह्य होगी। मात्रा की हानि 4% से अधिक नहीं होगी।

2. खराब मौसम के कपड़े आदि रक्षा प्रयोग के लिए आवश्यकित दोनों तरफ बिलोपित फैब्रिक प्लास्टर के रूप कलैडिंग सामग्री में भी उपरोक्त श्रेणी में आती है जैसा कि निर्वातकर्ता द्वारा घोषित किया गया है, कुल भार/वर्ग मीटरों के अनुसार उपरोक्त श्रेणियों के अंतर्गत आती है। ये सामग्रियां भी सारणी-2 में दी गई अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप होंगी।

## 2.2 पी.बी.सी. मेजपोश :—

पी.बी.सी. मेजपोश पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े का टुकड़ा है जिसे मेज डकने के लिए एक निश्चित आकार में काटा गया है। पी.बी.सी. मेज के कपड़े के निरोक्षण को प्रकिया सामान्य रूप से फैसी होगी जो पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के लिए है। पी.बी.सी. मेजपोश के लिए जांच निम्नलिखित के लिए की जायगी।

- पी.बी.सी. विलेयन का भार और चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार,
- मोटाई सहित विमाएं,
- बिजार्डिन, रंग और आधा,
- किनारों के साथ फिनिश,
- पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के लिए यथाअधिकृत दृष्टियां।

## 3. सह्यताएँ :—

3.1 पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के रोलों का मेजपोश की विमाएं वह जो क्रेता द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट की जाएं भार यदि संविधा में विनिर्दिष्ट न किया गया हो। रोलों की चौड़ाई और मेज के कपड़े के आकार की बाधत सांख्यिक विनिर्देशों पर  $\pm 5$  प्रतिशत की सह्यता अनुज्ञात की जायेगी।

3.2 सामग्री, निम्नलिखित को बाधत क्रेता के अवलिखित विनिर्देशों या अनुमोदित नमूनों के अनुरूप होगी :—

- मोटाई रेंज,
- विलेपित या आधारीक फैब्रिक का रंग या आधा,
- बिजार्डिन की तन्वुबन या विलेपित ग्रिड।

टिप्पण :—पी.बी.सी. विलेपिन : घोषित पी. बी. सी. विलेपिन भार पर +15 प्रतिशत और —5 प्रतिशत सह्यता अनुज्ञात की जाएगी अनुषंगता के लिए, सभी परीक्षण नमूनों के औसत मूल्य पर बिचार किया जाएगा।

3.3 सतही फिनिश किसी अप्रकार के मुख्य दोषों से मुक्त होगी, जैसा कि नीचे वर्गीकृत किया गया है :—

मुख्य दोषों का वर्गीकरण :—

- खरोंचे, कटे हुए चिह्न और छिद्र।
- नियमित अंतरालों पर दोहराए गए प्रिंटिंग दोष।
- अलेपित चोपियां/लाइनें।
- चैक्स साइमें और विराम चिह्न।
- विलेपित सतह पर परिवर्तित आधा।
- न्यूनतम चौड़ाई पर डालने वाले दोषपूर्ण किनारें।
- बिपविपी सतह।
- लम्बाई में लगभग 10 सें. मी. से अधिक या इसके बीच में छुट्टें।

(ix) असमान विलेपन।

(x) असमान नक्काशी जो भौतिक रूप को प्रभावित करती है।

3.4 किन्तु छोटे दोषों को जिन्हें नीचे वर्गीकृत किया गया है निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए अनुज्ञात किया जाएगा।

(क) कि ये बहुत छोटे स्थानों पर स्थित हों और सामान्यतः उत्पाद की गुणों या क्वालिटी का ह्रास न करने हों।

(ख) पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के श्रेणी क, ख के लिए 40 मीटर या इससे अधिक बाले प्रति रोल में न्यूनतम 10 छोटे दोष अनुभव किये जायेंगे।

टिप्पण : श्रेणी घ की दिशा में, यदि जिल्ब साजी के प्रयोजन के लिए पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों का प्रयोग किया जाता है, तो प्रति मीटर एक छोटा दोष अनुज्ञात किया जाएगा।

(ग) पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के सेजपोश की दशा में, एक दर्जन निरीक्षित टुकड़ों में एक छोटा दोष अनुज्ञात किया जा सकेगा।

छोटे दोषों का वर्गीकरण

(i) 10 मि.मी. के व्यास में तेल की बुंदों के चिन्हित और धब्बों का विद्यमान होना।

(ii) 10 से मी. तक की लम्बाई तक विलेपन की लाइनें।

(iii) केवल पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ों की श्रेणी क, ख और ग बुना हुआ के लिए कैंब्रिक में उत्पन्न बुनाई दोष, जैसे कि बुनाई, गांठे, लम्बे सिरे और बटाई, ढोले धागे कीटोज और लगभग 3 मीटर पर छिद्र।

ये पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े के रूप घ के लिए दोष नहीं समझे जायेंगे जब ये जिल्ब साजी के प्रयोजन के उपयोग के लिए अपेक्षित हों।

(iv) 10 से मी. से कम की लम्बाई तक छोटी चुनटे।

(v) मानक चौड़ाई से बाहर की तरफ लुटिया।

(vi) अंत के बाह्यर मुड़े हुए होंगे।

(vii) दोषपूर्ण किनारे, न्यूनतम चौड़ाई को प्रभावित नहीं करेंगे जैसे कि कटा हुआ, विकृत छल्लेदार, घुमावदार, आदि।

(viii) पिछली तरफ के विलेपन भौतिक दृश्य को प्रभावित नहीं करेंगे।

(ix) हल्की खुरदरी नक्काशी भौतिक रूप दृश्य को प्रभावित नहीं करेंगे।

(x) भौतिक दृश्य को प्रभावित न करते हुए हल्की चमकीली छपाई।

4. पैकिंग

पैकिंग का ढंग वह होगा जो फ्रेता द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट किया जाए। बंडलों के रूप में जिनमें रोल अन्तर्विष्ट हों, अच्छी तरह से बंध किए जायेंगे, और मजबूत होंगे। आकार को बना रख सके। परिवहन पार सकट से सुरक्षित रखने के लिए पैकिंग जलसह कागज पॉलिथीनी या पी.बी.सी. चर्म चादर से ढके होंगे। परिवहन द्वारा जारी किए गए मांगदमोंके पालन विनिर्माता/निर्यातकर्ताओं द्वारा किया जाएगा।

[फाइल सं. 6(20)/86-ई आई एण्ड ईपी]

एम.एस. हरिहरन, निदेशक

सारणी—1

पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़े (एक तरह कीटोड)

क्रम सं.	विशेषताएं	भारी	मध्यम	हल्का	सामान्य प्रयोजन	
		डब्ल्यू. डब्ल्यू. के. के. ई. एम. ई. एस.	डब्ल्यू. डब्ल्यू. के. के. ई. एस. ई. एस.	डब्ल्यू. डब्ल्यू. के. के. ई. एस. ई. एस.	डब्ल्यू. के. एस. एस.	
1.	टूटन सामर्थ्य कि.ग्रा./5 से.मी. न्यूनतम					
	(क) लम्बाई में	60 35 45 15 35 30 25 15	20 15 17 15	15 12		
	(ख) चौड़ाई	35 27.5 25 12.5 35 25 20 12	15 12 15 10	12 10		
2.	लकड़ द्वारा क्षति का प्रतिरोधक (चक्रों की सं. हजारों में) न्यूनतम	50 50 50 50 30 30 30 30	20 20 20 20	20 20		
3.	टूटन पर वीर्यीकरण न्यूनतम	यदि अपेक्षित हो, लम्बाई और चौड़ाई दोनों दिशाओं के लिये संविधानुसार की जायेगी।				
4.	न्यूनतम खरोच सामर्थ्य	यदि अपेक्षित हो, लम्बाई और चौड़ाई दोनों दिशाओं के लिये संविधानुसार की जायेगी।				
5.	विलेपन का मांसजन	प्लाईज किसी भी पण्डपा टुकड़े के 2.75 कि.ग्रा. भार के अंतर्गत 10 मि.मी. से अधिक प्रलग नहीं होगी।				
6.	ताप का प्रतिरोधक और मात्रा की हानि जब 100--2 से.से. पर 24 घंटे के लिये परीक्षित किया जाये तब रिताव या चिपचिपाहट नहीं होगी।	मात्रा की हानि 5 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होगी।				
7.	-- 2 से.से. पर शीत से प्रतिरोध	विलेपन में कोई हानि या दरार नहीं होगी जब एक घंटे के प्रभावन के पश्चात् लगभग 6 मि. मीटर ध्यान वाले स्टील पोन से मुकाब परीक्षण किया जाये।				
8.	विमा परिवर्तन (सिकुड़न) अधिकतम	लंबाई और चौड़ाई दोनों दिशाओं में सिकुड़न 3 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होगी।				
9.	शुष्क और गीली घिसाई के लिये रंग का पश्कापन।	बिना रंगी सूती कैंब्रिक का कोई भी धब्बा नहीं होगा। घिसन चक्रों की संख्या संविधानुसार होगी।				
10.	हल्का करने के लिये रंग का पश्कापन	स्वरित हल्के प्रकाश में या बिना की रोशनी में पान करना।				
11.	मिश्रकण परीक्षण।	जब परीक्षण टुकड़े को प्रांतवित जल में 60 से.से. पर 10 मिनट के लिये जोर से हिलाया जाये तब उसके मूल रंग में कोई मोटाई या परिवर्तन नहीं होगा।				

1	2	3	4	5
12. सपट प्रतिरोध ।	साइट पास करने के लिये प्रस्ताव सपट सब तक नहीं बैठेगी जब तक कि कपड़े की पिछली तह मुलसे नहीं ।			
13. केवल तीन प्रकारों के लिये रंगायनों से प्रतिरोध ( $27 \pm 2^\circ$ से. ग्रेड पर 24 घंटों के लिये निमज्जन) ।	जब परीक्षण टुकड़ों का एक प्रतिशत माबुन का बोल, एक प्रतिशत सोडियम कार्बोनेट बोल और दो प्रतिशत सोडियम हाइड्रोक्साईड बोल में परीक्षण किया जाये ता उसके रंग में कोई मीटापन या विकृति नहीं होगी । ये परीक्षण तीन पुनः-पुनः नमूनों में, स्वतन्त्र रूप से किये जायेंगे ; प्रत्येक बोल के लिये छलन नमूना होगा ।			
14. जेशोलिंग परीक्षण (केवल विस्तारित प्रकार के लिये) ।	30 सेकेंड के लिये एसिटोन में निमज्जन के पश्चात् बरार का कोई भी बिम्ब प्रदर्शित प्राकृत करेंगे ।			

## गारपी—2

पी.बी.सी. चर्म कपड़ा (दोनों तरफ कोटेड)

क्रम सं.	अपेक्षाएँ	खराब मौसम के कपड़े सूती और ज्योरेन कैंब्रिक आधार)	लचीली पलस्तर कैंब्रिक सूती रेयोन/ रेयोन मायलोन और ग्लास कैंब्रिक	क्लोडिंग कैंब्रिक (मायलोन कैंब्रिक आधार)
1	2	3	4	5
1. टूटन सामर्थ्य कि. ग्राम/ 5 सें.मी. चौड़ाई न्यूनतम	ताना 35 बाना 25	180 (ताना और बाना)	275 (ताना और बाना)	
2. कि. ग्राम में खरोंच सामर्थ्य न्यूनतम	ताना 10, बाना 8 बी.एस. 3546	16 (ताना और बाना)	20 (ताना और बाना)	
3. लचीली लचक द्वारा क्षति का प्रतिरोध जको की बरार संख्या न्यूनतम	50,000	—	40,000	
4. कम ताप का प्रतिरोधक	शीत बरार 20. सें. ग्रेड से तापमान अधिक नहीं होगा।	जब 6.25 मि.मीटर मेंड्रिल के बारों ओर 180 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर झुकाया जाये तब बरार उत्पन्न किए बिना कम से कम 48 घंटों के लिये 20 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर लचकदार रहेगा।	जब 6.25 मि.मीटर मेंड्रिल के बारों ओर 180 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर झुकाया जाये तब बरार उत्पन्न किये बिना कम से कम 48 घंटों के लिये 20 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर लचकदार रहेगा।	
4. 24 घंटों के लिये 100 ± 20 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर ताप का प्रतिरोध और लेपित मात्रा की कमी।	रिसाव और बिपबिपाहट नहीं होगी। मात्रा की हानि 4 प्रतिशत घाई. एस. 3322 से अधिक नहीं होगी।	—	रिसाव और बिपबिपाहट नहीं होगी। मात्रा की हानि 4 प्रतिशत से अधिक नहीं होगी।	
6. विलेपन का आसन्न	किसी भी परीक्षण टुकड़े में 2.75 कि. ग्राम भार के अन्तर्गत विलेपन 10 मि. मीटर से अधिक पुनः नहीं होगी। भा.भा. 7016 पी-बी या भा.भा. 1259 "जी" या भा.भा. 3322 "ई"	किसी भी परीक्षण टुकड़े में 2.75 कि. ग्राम भार के अन्तर्गत विलेपन 10 मि. मीटर से अधिक पुनः नहीं होगी।	किसी भी परीक्षण टुकड़े में 2.75 कि. ग्राम भार के अन्तर्गत विलेपन 10 मि. मीटर से अधिक पुनः नहीं होगी।	
7. जल प्रवेश	भा.भा. 3322 के अनुसार परीक्षण पास करना।	—	—	
8. जल शोषकता.	—	30 मिनट के लिये 50 सें. मीटर का स्थिर जल शोष सक्षम होगा।	30 मिनट के लिये 50 सें. मीटर का स्थिर जल शोष सक्षम होगा।	
9. स्वरित अवस्था पर प्रतिरोध 168 घंटों के लिये 70. सें. ग्रेड ± 1 <sup>0</sup> सें. ग्रेड पर स्वरित अवस्था से प्रतिरोध (वैकल्पिक परीक्षण)	—	बस प्रभाव के पश्चात् टूटन सामर्थ्य काल प्रभाव से पहले 65 प्रतिशत से कम नहीं होगा।	बस प्रभाव के पश्चात् टूटन सामर्थ्य काल प्रभाव से पहले 65 प्रतिशत से कम नहीं होगा।	
10. रंग का पक्कापन क. शुष्क और गोली रंगड़ाई	क. परीक्षण पास करने के लिये. भा.भा. 3322 ख. 5 या उससे अधिक भा.भा. 686	(क) — (ख) —	(क) परीक्षण पास करने के लिये। (ख) 4 या उससे अधिक।	

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1987

## ORDER

S.O. 1685.—Whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary and expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India, that the P.V.C. Leather Cloth shall be subject to Quality Control and Inspection prior to export;

And whereas the Central Government has formulated the proposals specified below for the said purpose and has forwarded the same to the Export Inspection Council of India as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said sub-rule and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce (Department of Commerce) No. S.O. 48 dated the 3rd January, 1981, published in the Gazette of India, Part II Section-3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 3rd January, 1981 the Central Government hereby publishes the said proposals for the information of the public likely to be affected thereby.

2. Notice is hereby given that any person desiring to forward any objections or suggestions with respect to the said proposals may forward the same within fortyfive days of the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette to the Export Inspection Council of India, 11th floor, 'Pragati Tower', 26 Rajendra Place, New Delhi-110008.

## PROPOSALS

(1) To notify that P.V.C. Leather Cloth shall be subject to quality control and inspection prior to export;

(2) To specify the type of quality control and inspection in accordance with the draft export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1980 as set out in Annexure-I to this Order, as the type of quality control and inspection which shall be applied to such P.V.C. Leather cloth prior to export;

(3) To recognise—

(i) national or international standards, and

(ii) contractual specifications as agreed to between the buyer and seller subject to the minimum specifications as referred to in Annexure-II for the respective grade as the standard specification for such P.V.C. Leather Cloth.

(4) To prohibit the export in the course of international trade of such P.V.C. Leather Cloth unless every consignment thereof is accompanied by an inspection certificate for export issued by any one of the agencies established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) to the effect that such PVC Leather Cloth satisfy the conditions relating to Quality Control and Inspection and are exportworthy.

2. Nothing in this order shall apply to the export by land, air or sea of bonafide trade samples of P.V.C. Leather Cloth to the prospective buyer, provided f.o.b. value of such samples do not exceed Rs. 500.

3. In this Order 'P.V.C. Leather Cloth' shall mean cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon, or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

## ANNEXURE-I

Draft rules proposed to be made under section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963).

1. Short title and commencement : (1) These rules may be called the Export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1987.

(2) These shall come into force on the date of their final publication in the Official Gazette.

2. Definitions.—In these rules, unless the context otherwise requires :—

- (a) 'Act' means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963);
- (b) 'Agency' means any one of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Act at Bombay, Calcutta, Cochin, Delhi and Madras;
- (c) 'approved unit' means a manufacturing unit approved by the agency as having satisfied the requirements of IPQC.
- (d) 'consignmentwise inspection' means the process of determining whether a consignment of P.V.C. Leather Cloth meant for export complies with the standard specifications, by inspection and testing by the agency in a manner as laid down by the Council;
- (e) 'Council' means the Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;
- (f) 'In-process Quality Control' (hereinafter also referred to as IPQC) means a system of Quality Control by which a manufacturing unit ensure that P.V.C. Leather Cloth are manufactured to conform to the standard specifications by exercising controls at different stages of purchase of materials and components, manufacture, inspection, preservation and parking, in a manner as laid down by the Council;
- (g) 'P.V.C. Leather Cloth' means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination;
- (h) 'periodic visit' means a visit made by Officer(s) of the agency to the approved unit at intervals to ensure compliance of the requirements of IPQC in the unit; and
- (i) 'spot check' means an export consignment to ensure its conformity to the standard specifications in a manner as laid down by the Council.

3. Basis of Inspection : (1) Inspection of P.V.C. Leather Cloth intended for export shall be carried out with a view to seeing that the same conforms to the standard specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act;

- (a) On the basis of in-process quality control exercised by an approved unit in accordance with sub-rule (2) or
- (b) On the basis of consignmentwise inspection, or
- (c) by both.

(2) In-process Quality Control : (i) Any manufacturing unit intending to export P.V.C. Leather Cloth manufactured by it and having adequate IPQC shall apply to the agency intimating therein its intention to seek approval under IPQC.

(ii) The agency shall then arrange to assess adequacy of IPQC exercised by the unit and if satisfied, the agency shall declare the unit as an approved unit

(iii) For the purpose of satisfying itself that necessary IPQC is continued to be maintained by the approved unit, the agency shall carry out periodic visits and spot checks

(iv) The approval accorded to the unit under IPQC may however, be withdrawn by the agency as per norms laid down in this regard by the Council, after giving a notice of minimum period of seven days.

(v) A unit, whose approval has been withdrawn may after rectifying the deficiencies make fresh application to the agency for fresh approval.

4. Procedure of Inspection.—(1) An exporter intending to export a consignment of P.V.C. leather cloth shall submit an intimation for inspection, in writing, to the Agency of his intention so to do not less than seven days prior to the despatch of the consignment to enable the agency to carry on inspection of the consignment as per rule 3 and the procedure laid down by the Council.

(2) The Agency, on satisfying itself that the consignment conforms to the standard specifications and requirements of the Act shall issue an inspection certificate for export within seven days of receipt of the intimation, provided that where the agency is not so satisfied, it shall, within the said period of seven days, refuse in writing to issue the certificate alongwith the reasons therefor.

(3) Subsequent to certification, the agency may reassess the consignment in storage, in transit or at the port. In the event of the consignment being found not conforming to the requirements, the certificate originally issued shall be withdrawn.

5. Place of Inspection.—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out.

(a) at the premises of the manufacturing unit;

or

(b) at the premises at which the goods are offered for inspection, provided adequate facilities for the purposes exist therein;

or

(c) at the port of shipment.

6. Inspection fee.—Inspection shall be paid by the exporter to the agency as under :—

(i) (a) for exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the fob value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) for exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the fob value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) (a) subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturers/exporters who are registered as small scale manufacturing units with the concerned Government of State/Union territories.

7. Appeal.—(1) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the agency to issue a certificate under sub-rule (2) of rule 4 may within ten days of the receipt of communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of Experts as may be appointed for the purpose, by the Central Government, consisting of non-officials of atleast two-thirds of the total membership of the panel.

(2) The quorum for the panel shall be three.

(3) The appeal shall be disposed of by the panel within fifteen days of its receipt.

## ANNEXURE-II

### MINIMUM SPECIFICATION OF PVC LEATHER

#### CLOTH

#### 1. Material and Manufacture

1.1 Coating.—(a) PVC leather cloth shall be manufactured by coating uniformly or by laminating on one or both sides of the basic fabric a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer. This shall be categorised as follows :—

(i) Solid Leather Cloth.—Vinyl coated fabrics are manufactured by applying to one/or both sides of a fabric substantially continuous coating of suitably compounded polymer of vinyl chloride or a copolymer, the major constituent of which is vinyl chloride.

(ii) Expanded vinyl coated fabrics.—Expanded vinyl coated fabrics are manufactured by applying on one/or both sides of a fabric a substantially continuous coating of suitably compound polymer of vinyl chloride or a copolymer, the major constituent of which is vinyl chloride, Part of the PVC coating is expanded.

NOTE : Woven or knitted means the basic fabric is woven or knitted as the case may be

(b) The composition of the coating compound shall be to impart the finished product the desired appearance and strength.

(c) The coating shall be non-blooming, free from pin holes and other mechanical defects. It shall not be tacky and shall not have disagreeable odour.

Note : In the case of Grade-D PVC Leather Cloth meant for book binding purpose, the pin holes although visible, but not permeable to water, will be allowed.

1.2 Basic Fabric.—The basic fabric used for this purpose shall be of good quality, construction and strength. It shall be clean and reasonably free from weaving and manufacturing defects so that no major visual defects are observed on the finished coating.

2. Grades.—There shall be four grades.

Grade	Expected Uses	Minimum total weight in Gms/Sq. Mt.
A. Heavy Duty	Used in heavy transport, upholstery, suitcases and luggage ware etc.	650
B. Medium Duty	Used in light transport, upholstery, suitcases and luggage ware etc.	450
C. Light Duty	Used in light fabricated item or sheetings, car head lining, door and side panels, footwear etc.	300
D. General purpose	Used in book binding, (cotton fabrics) wall covering, sheeting, small hand bags, purses, decorative purposes etc.	200

2.1 The material shall also comply with the requirements given in Table 1. Each grade mentioned above may also be supplied either woven or knitted base fabrics and shall be designated as follows :—

WS—Woven 'Solid' Leather Cloth.

WE—Woven 'Expanded' Leather Cloth

KS—Knitted 'Solid' Leather Cloth.

KE—Knitted 'Expanded' Leather Cloth.

Marking.—The material shall be marked with the manufacturers name or trade mark, if any, grade and type of material month and year of manufacture and length of material in metres.

NOTE :

1. For jute or other fancy textile fabrics base leather cloth the total weight shall be within the range declared by the exporter but shall not be less than Grade 'A'. The



minimum breaking strength shall be 90 and 95 kg/5 cms. in warp and weft directions, respectively if not otherwise specified in the contract. The coating shall also withstand an exposure of 24 hours in an air oven at 100±2°C without showing signs of exudation or stickiness. The loss in mass shall not be greater than 4 per cent.

2. The both side coated fabric meant for use in defence (as revetment, cladding material) foul weather clothing etc. may also fall in the above grades as per the total weight/1 sq. mt., declared by exporter. These materials shall also comply with the requirements given in Table-2.

## 2.2 P.V.C. Table Cloth

PVC Table Cloth is a piece of PVC Leather Cloth cut into a definite size for use as table covers. The procedure to be followed for inspection of PVC Table Cloth shall, in general, be the same as for PVC Leather Cloth. The PVC Table Cloth shall be examined for:

- weights of PVC coating and total weight of leather cloth,
- dimensions including thickness,
- design, colour and shade,
- finish along the selvages,
- defects as laid down for PVC Leather Cloth.

## 3. Tolerances:

3.1 Dimensions of PVC Leather Cloth rolls or table cloth shall be as specified by the buyer if not specified in the contract a tolerance upto +5 per cent shall be permitted in the contractual specifications in respect of the width of the rolls or size of the table cloth.

3.2 The material shall conform strictly to the buyer's written down specifications or approved samples in respect of:

- Thickness range,
- Colour or shade of the coating or basic fabric,
- Design grain or print of the coating.

Note: PVC Coating—A tolerance of +15 per cent and—5 per cent shall be allowed on declared PVC coating weight. For conformity, the average value of all the test samples are to be considered.

3.3 The surface finish shall be free from any major defect classified below:—

## CLASSIFICATION OF MAJOR DEFECTS

- Scratches, cutting marks and holes.
- Printing defects repeated at regular interval.
- Uncoated patches/lines.
- Channel Lines and stop marks.
- Shade variation on coated surface.
- Defective salvaged affecting the minimum width.
- Tacky surface.

(viii) Creases in the centre or their about more than 10 cms in length

(ix) Uneven coating.

(x) Uneven embossing which affects the physical appearances.

3.4 The minor defects as classified below shall however be allowed under the conditions that:

- these are localised to very small areas and do not generally impair the properties or quality of the product;
- maximum of 10 minor defects may be allowed in each roll of 40 metres or more for Grade A, B of PVC Leather Cloth.  
Note.—In case of Grade D, PVC Leather Cloth when used for book binding purposes, one minor defect per metre will be allowed.
- In case of table covers of PVC Leather Cloth one minor defect may be allowed in one dozen pieces inspected.

## Classification of minor defects:

- Presence of marks of oil drops and stains upto 10 mm in diameter.
- Coating lines of length upto 10 cms.
- Minor weaving defects arising out of defects in the fabric like weaving, knots, long ends and slubs, loose threads, kitties and about 3 mm done up holes for (Knitted) Grade A, B and C PVC leather cloth only.

These may not be considered as defects in Group D PVC Leather Cloth when the same is required to be used for book binding purposes.

- Small creases less than 10 cm in length.
- Faults outside the standard width.
- Border folded at the ends.
- Defective salvaged not affecting the minimum width e.g. cut, distorted, loopy, curled etc.
- Backside coating not affecting the physical appearance.
- Slight uneven embossing not affecting the physical appearance.
- Slightly flushed print not affecting the physical appearance.

## 4. Packing:

Mode of packing shall be as specified by the buyer. The packages as bundles containing the rolls shall be well closed and sturdy enough to retain shape. The packages shall be covered with water proof paper, polythene or PVC Sheeting to protect the contents from environmental hazards. The guidelines issued by the Council shall be followed by the manufacturers/exporters

[P. No. 6(20)/86-FI&FP]

N. S. HARIHARAN, Director

TABLE-1

## PVC LEATHER CLOTH (ONE SIDE COATED)

Sl. No.	Characteristics	Heavy				Medium				Light				General pur	
		WS	WE	KS	KE	WS	WE	KS	KE	WS	WE	KS	KE	WS	KS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.	Breaking strength, kg/5 cms Min.														
(a)	Longitudinal	60	35	45	15	35	30	25	15	20	15	17	15	15	12
(b)	Transverse	35	27.5	25	12.5	35	25	20	12	15	12	15	10	12	10

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
2. Resistance to damage by Flexing (no. of cycles in thousand) Min.	50	50	50	50	30	30	30	30	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
3. % Elongation at Break Min.	If required, shall be as per the contract for both longitudinal and transverse directions.														
4. Tear strength Min.	If required, shall be as per contract for both longitudinal and transverse directions.														
5. Adhesion of Coating	Plies shall not separate more than 10 mm under 2.75 kgs load in any test piece.														
6. Resistance to Heat and Loss of mass	No exudation for stickiness when tested at $100 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ for 24 for 24 hours Loss of mass not greater than 5 %														
7. Resistance to cold at $0 - 2^\circ\text{C}$	No cracking or damage to coating when tested bent around a 6 mm diameter steel pin after exposure for one hour.														
8. Dimensional change (shrinkage) max.	The shrinkage shall not be more than 3 % in both longitudinal and transverse directions.														
9. Colour fastness to dry and wet rubbing	No staining of standard undyed cotton fabric. Number of abrading cycle to be as per the contract														
10. Colour fastness to light	To pass either fastness to daylight or accelerated aging light.														
11. Bleeding Test	No tackiness or change in original shade when test piece is violently shaken or 10 minutes at $60^\circ\text{C}$ in distilled water.														
12. Flame Resistance.	To pass the light i.e. the flame shall not propagate until the back of the cloth is charred.														
13. Resistance to Chemicals 24 hrs. immersion at $27 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ For Solid type only.	No tackiness or deterioration in shade of the test piece when tested in one percent soap solution, one percent sodium carbonate solution and 2 percent sodium hydroxide solution, when conducted independently on three different samples, on each for each test solution.														
14. Gelling Test (for expanded type only)	After immersion in acetone for 30 seconds, there shall be no sign of cracking														

TABLE—II

## PVC LEATHER CLOTH (BOTH SIDE COATED)

S. No.	Requirements	Foul weather clothing (cotton or rayon fabric base)	Fabric revetment flexible rayon-cotton blend, rayon, nylon or glass fabric	Cladding Fabric (Nylon fabric base)
1. Breaking Strength kg/5 cm. width Min.		Warp 35 Weft 25	180 (warp and weft)	275 (warp and weft)
2. Tear Strength Kg Min.		Warp 10, Weft 8 B.S. 3546	18 (warp and weft)	20 (warp and weft)
3. Resistance to damage by flex cracking number of cycles Min.		50,000	—	40,000
4. Resistance to low temp.		Cold crack temp. not more than $-20^\circ\text{C}$	Shall remain flexible at $20^\circ\text{C}$ for at least 48 hours without cracking when bent to $180^\circ\text{C}$ around a 6.25 mm. diameter drill. No exudation or stickiness, loss of mass not exceed 4%.	Shall remain flexible at $-20^\circ\text{C}$ for at least 48 hours without cracking when bent to $180^\circ\text{C}$ around a 6.25 mm dia. mandril.
5. Resistance to heat at $100 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ , for 24 hours and loss of mass of coating.		No exudation or stickiness. Loss of mass not to exceed 4% IS : 3322	—	No exudation or stickiness, loss of mass not exceed 4%
6. Adhesion of coating.		Coating shall not separate beyond 10mm under 2.75kg load in any test piece IS : 7016 P-V Or IS : 1259 'G' Or IS : 3322 E	Coating shall not separate beyond 10mm under 2.75kg. load, in any test piece	Coating shall not separate beyond 10mm under 2.75 kg load in any test piece.
7. Water Penetration		To pass the test as per IS : 3322	—	—
8. Water Proofness		—	Shall withstand static water head of 50 cm for 30 minutes	Shall withstand static water head of 50 cms. for 30 minutes
9. Resistance to accelerated ageing at $70^\circ\text{C} \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ for 168 hours (Optional Test)		—	Breaking strength and Tear strength after ageing shall not be less than 65 % of the before ageing value.	Break strength and Tear strength after ageing shall not be less than 65 of the before ageing value.
10. Colour Fastness (a) Dry and Wet rubbing		(a) to pass the test IS : 3322 (b) 5 or better IS : 686	(a) — (b) —	(a) To pass the test (b) 4 or better

## ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1987

का.घा. 1686 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व इस्पात खात और कोयला मंत्रालय कोयला विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. का. घा. 2236 तारीख 6 मई, 1985 द्वारा इसमें संशोधन अधिसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिच्छेद में 716.00 एकड़ लगभग या 289.75 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) माप की भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना कोयला श्रमक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन दे दी थी ;

और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन उक्त भूमि को बाबत कोई सूचना नहीं दी गई है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, 25 मई, 1987 से प्रारंभ होने वाली एक वर्ष की और अवधि को उन अवधि के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है, जिसके भीतर केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त भूमि या ऐसी भूमि में या उन पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों के अर्जन की अपने आशय की सूचना दे सकेगी।

## अनुसूची

दक्षिण चौरधारा ब्लाक  
दक्षिण करनपुरा कोयला क्षेत्र  
जिला हजारीबाग (बिहार)

रेखांक सं. 1/113/84  
तारीख 17-8-1984  
(पूर्वोक्त के लिये अधिसूचित की जाने वाली भूमि)

क्रम सं.	ग्राम	बाना	बाना सं.	जिला	क्षेत्र एकड़ों में	टिप्पणियाँ
1.	चैनगरा	रामगढ़	57	हजारीबाग	716.00	भाग
कुल क्षेत्र :						716.00 एकड़ (लगभग)
या						289.75 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन :—

क--ख रेखा, चैनगरा और बाना ग्रामों का सम्मिलित सीमा के भाग के साथ-साथ जाती है।

ख--ग--घ : रेखा, चैनगरा ग्राम से होकर जाती है।

घ--ङ : रेखा, बानीदर नदी की दक्षिणी सीमा के भाग से साथ-साथ जाती है।

ङ--क : रेखा, चौरधारा और चैनगरा ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है, जो कोयला श्रमक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अर्जित चौरधारा न्यूनतम विस्तार और चौरधारा ब्लाक के साथ सम्मिलित सीमा का भाग बनती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[स. 43019/32/84-सी.ए.]

समय सिंह, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1987

S.O. 1686—Whereas by the notification of Government of India in the then Ministry of the Steel, Mines and Coal, Department of Coal No. S.O. 2236 dated the 6th May, 1985, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in the land measuring 716.00 acres (approximately) or 289.75 hectares (approximately) in the locality specified in the schedule appended hereto;

And whereas in respect of the said land no notice under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act has been given;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby specifies a further period of one year commencing from the 25th May, 1987, as the period within which the Central Government may give notice of its intention to acquire the said land or any rights in or over such land.

## SCHEDULE

SOUTH CHORDHARA BLOCK  
SOUTH KARANPURA COAL FIELD  
DISTRICT HAZARIBAGH (BIHAR)

Drg. No. Rev/113/84

Dated 17-8-1984

(Showing land notified for prospecting)

Serial number	Village	Thana	Thana number	District	Area in acres	Remarks
1.	Chaingara	Ramgarh	57	Hazaribagh	716.00	Part
Total area or				716.00 acres (approximately) 289.75 hectares (approximately)		

## Boundary description :--

- A-B line passes along the part common boundary of the villages Chaingara and Lapanga.  
 B-C-D lines passes through village Chaingara.  
 D-E line passes along the part Southern boundary of Damodar River.  
 E-A line passes along the common boundary of villages Chordhara and Chaingara which forms part common boundary with Chordhara Block Extension and Chordhara Block Acquired under sub-section (i) of section 9 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 43019/32/84-CA]

SAMAY SINGH, Under Secy.

## कृषि मंत्रालय

(कृषि अनुसंधान तथा शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 5 मई, 1987.

का. अ. 1687 --पार्षजनिक् परिषद (अनधिकृत रूप से कब्जा जमाए रखने वालों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 में प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा पंजाब कृषि विश्व विद्यालय, लुधियाना के संपदा अधिकारी को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए संपदा अधिकारों के रूप में नियुक्त करत है, जो प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उपयोग करेंगे तथा पंजाब कृषि विश्वविद्यालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन मकान, मर्यादा, स्टेशन, प्रयोगशालाओं और केन्द्रों सहित परिसर के मामले में उक्त अधिनियम (क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत) आने वाले संपदा अधिकारों के कार्यों को देखेंगे।

[स. 29(2)/84--स्थापना]

एम. जी. मेनन, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agricultural Research and Education)

New Delhi, the 5th May, 1987

S.O. 1687--In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the Estate Officer of the Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana to be the estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers

conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate officer by or under the said Act (within the limits of the jurisdiction) in respect of the premises under the administrative control of the Punjab Agricultural University including the houses, Institutes, Stations, Laboratories and Centres

[No. 29(2)/84 Estt]

M. G. MENON, Under Secy.

## जल संसाधन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पत्र)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1987

का. अ. 1688--केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक बर्कर्स (राजगार का विनियम) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) और (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एतद्वारा डाक बर्कर्स (राजगार का विनियम) नियम, 1962 को संशोधित करने हुए, निम्न निम्नित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् --

1 (i) इस नियमों का नाम डाक बर्कर्स (राजगार का विनियम) (संशोधन) नियम, 1987 होगा।

(ii) ये राजकीय राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 डाक बर्कर्स (राजगार का विनियम) नियम, 1962 के नियम 4 में--

(1) उप-नियम (4) को हटाया जाए।

(ii) उप-नियम (5) को उपनियम (4) में क्रमांकित किया जाए और इस प्रकार बदले हुए उप नियम (4) में —

(क) खंड (i) को हटाया जाए।

(ख) खंड (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) और (vi) को क्रमशः खंड (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) और (v) के रूप में क्रमांकित किया जाए।

[का. स एलबी-13012/2/87-अवर सचिव (एल)]  
सुदेश कुमार, अवर सचिव

नोट — डाक वर्कर्स (रोजगार का विनियम) नियम, 1962 भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), दिनांक 1. जून, 1972 में का आ. स. 1810 के तहत प्रकाशित हुए थे।

#### MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1987

S.O. 1688.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and (2) of section 8 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Rules, 1962 namely :—

1. (1) These Rules may be called the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Rules, 1987.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In rule 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Rules, 1962,—
  - (i) sub-rule (4) shall be omitted.
  - (ii) sub-rule (5) shall be renumbered as sub-rule (4) and in sub-rule (4) as so renumbered,—
    - (a) clause (i) shall be omitted ;
    - (b) clause (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) shall be renumbered as clauses (i), (ii), (iii) (iv) and (v) respectively.

[F. No. LB-13012/2/87-US (L)]  
SUDESH KUMAR, Under Secy.

Note.—The Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Rules, 1962 were published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated 1st June, 1962 under S.O. No. 1810.

#### उद्योग मंत्रालय

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 1987

आदेश

का. आ. 1689 :—व्यापार और पण्य वस्तु चिन्ह नियम, 1959 का और संशोधन करने के लिए कतिपय नियमों का एक प्रारूप, व्यापार और पण्य वस्तु चिन्ह अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 43) की धारा 133 की उपधारा (1) की अपेक्षानुसार, भारत सरकार के उद्योग मंत्रालय, औद्योगिक विकास विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 399 तारीख 23 जनवरी, 1987 के अधीन, भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) तारीख 14 फरवरी, 1982 के पृष्ठ 592 पर प्रकाशित किया गया था।

और यह अधिसूचना 4 मार्च, 1987 को जलता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी। और उक्त अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन के दो मास के भीतर

ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों, से जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी आशेष और मुद्दाव मागे गए थे,

और उक्त प्रारूप नियमों के संबंध में जनता से कोई आशेष और मुद्दाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए हैं,

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 133 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, व्यापार और पण्य वस्तु चिन्ह नियम, 1959 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है अर्थात् :—

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम व्यापार और पण्य वस्तु चिन्ह (संशोधन) नियम, 1987 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. व्यापार और पण्य वस्तु चिन्ह नियम, 1959 के नियम 114 के अधीन छटी अनुसूची के नीचे टिप्पण के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

टिप्पण.—“उच्चतर यात्रा भत्ता और निर्वाह भत्ता की पात्रता के लिए साक्षी की वार्षिक आय कम से कम 16000 रुपये या अधिक होगी”।

[का. स. 26/4/82-पी. पी. सी.]

एस के. लाल, संयुक्त सचिव

#### MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Industrial Development)

New Delhi, the 26th June, 1987

#### ORDER

S.O. 1689.—Whereas certain draft rules further to amend the Trade and Merchandise Marks Rules, 1959 were published as required by sub-section (1) of Section 133 of the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958, (43 of 1958), at page 59 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated 14th February, 1987 under the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry, Department No. S. O. 389, dated the 23rd January, 1987;

And whereas, this notification was made available to the public on the 4th March, 1987.

And, whereas, objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby within two months of the publication of the said notification;

And whereas, no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said draft rules;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 133 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Trade and Merchandise Marks Rules, 1959 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Trade and Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Rules, 1987.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Trade and Merchandise Marks, 1959, for the Note below the 6th Schedule under Rule 114, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

NOTE :—“For eligibility for higher travelling allowance and subsistence allowance the annual income of the witness shall be at least Rs. 16,000/- or more”.

[F. No. 26/4/82-PP & C  
S. K. LALL, Jt. Secy

## पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 22 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1690.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजिरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनक्वायड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह एनक्वायड घोषित किया है।

वर्णित कि उक्त भूमि में तिनबड़ कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि., वर्णित बिच्छी, आर. सी. वन रोड, बडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मूनवार्ड व्यक्तिगत रूप से हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

हजिरा - बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पाइपलाइन

राज्य - गुजरात जिला - पंचमहाल तालुका - हालोल

गांव	सर्वे न.	हेक्टेयर	आर.	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
वीन्टोज	266/2	0	14	00
	267/1	0	10	00
	277	0	17	10
	266/1	0	27	10
	264	0	24	00

[स. O-14016/459/84-जो पी]

## MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM &amp; NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1987

S.O. 1690.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the port of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to require the right of user therein.

Provided that any person interested in the said land may within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent

Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd., Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat district : Panchmahal Taluka : Halol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Arc	Centiare
Vintoj	266/2	0	14	00
	267/1	0	10	00
	277	0	17	10
	266/1	0	27	10
	264	0	24	00

[No. O-14016/459/84-GP]

का. आ. 1691.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजिरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनक्वायड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह एनक्वायड घोषित किया है।

वर्णित कि उक्त भूमि में तिनबड़ कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि., वर्णित बिच्छी, आर. सी. वन रोड बडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख 21 में दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसी आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मूनवार्ड व्यक्तिगत रूप से हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

हजिरा से बरेली में जगदीशपुर तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य - गुजरात जिला - सुरत तालुका - आलपाड़ा

गांव	सर्वे/ब्लॉक न.	हेक्टेयर	आर.	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
मरोली	21	0	01	00

[स. O - 14016/123/83-प्रोच]

S.O. 1691.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building, R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Olpad

Village	Survey No.	Hec.	Acre	Cent.
Saroli	21	0	01	00

[No. O-14016/123/83-Prod.]

या. आ. 1692 यन: केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजारी से सबरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस अपॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यन: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्व लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना प्राण्य एनदुपाबद्ध घोषित किया है।

बनते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अपॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, वडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजारा से सबरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए  
राज्य : गुजरात जिला : सुरत तालुका : बायर्सि

गांव	सर्वे/ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टेयर	आर.	सेण्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
परीयाव	510	0	09	50
	कैनाल-1	0	04	80
	कैनाल-2	0	04	80
	511	0	03	00

[सं. O - 14016/125/83 - प्रोड.]

S.O. 1692—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building k. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Chaiyasi

Village	Survey No./ Block No.	Hec tare	Acre	Centiare
Varivav	510	0	09	50
	Canal-1	0	04	80
	Canal-2	0	04	80
	511	0	03	00

[No. O-14016/125/83-Prod.]

का आ. 1693 यन: केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजारा-बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पार्श्व लाइन गैस अपॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यन: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनदुपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्व लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करके हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना प्राण्य एनदुपाबद्ध घोषित किया है।

बनते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अपॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, वडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा - बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य - गुजरात जिला - मुरत तालुका - बरेली

सर्वे/अधिकृत	हेक्टेयर	घाट	सेन्टीयर	
1	2	3	4	5
वृत्त	34	0	51	75
	45	0	28	50
	14	0	15	00
	1	0	01	00
	43	0	01	00
	7	0	78	00
	6	0	02	00
	8	0	49	00

[सं. O - 14016/129/83 - प्रोड]

S.O. 1693.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And where it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 5 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building, R.C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change line

	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Arc	Cent- tiare
Vihal	34	0	51	75
	45	0	28	50
	44	0	15	00
	1	0	01	00
	43	0	01	00
	7	0	78	00
	6	0	02	00
	8	0	49	00

[No. O-14016/129/83-Prod.]

का. प्र. 1694.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा - बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईप लाइन गैस अथोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः जब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का प्रस्ताव आगव एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में जिनका कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़दरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिवृष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा - बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य - गुजरात जिला - मुरत तालुका - कोसम

गांव	सर्वे नं.	हेक्टेयर	घाट	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
कोसम	387	0	07	00

[सं. O - 14016/142/83 - प्रोड]

S.O. 1694.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Olpad

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Arc	Centi-tiare
Kosam	387	0	07	00

[No. O-14016/142/83-Prod.]



का. आ. 1695.—अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजिरा-बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथोरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार-का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकरण, गैस अथोरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग आर. सी. दत्त रोड, बडोदरा का इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकना।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजिरा - बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए  
राज्य—गुजरात जिला—सुरत तालुका—अलिपाड़

गांव	ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
खलीपोर	14/ए	0	17	81
	12	0	10	66

[स. O-14016/143/83-प्रोड]

S.O. 1695.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Olpad

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Khalipor	14/A	0	17	81
	12	0	10	66

[No. O-14016/143/83-Prod.]

का. आ. 1696.—अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजिरा-बरेली से जगदीशपुर पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथोरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथोरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, बडोदरा का इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजिरा - बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—सुरत	तालुका—अलिपाड़
गांव	सं नं./ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टर आर सेन्टीयर
मूलद	141	0 20, 30

[सं. ओ-14016/144/83—प्रोड]

S.O. 1696.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Olpad

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Mulad	141	0	20	30

[No. O-14016/144/83-Prod.]

का. प्रा. 1697.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईपलाईन गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इन्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वाक्य अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, प्रार. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी बिधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा से बरेली में जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए  
राज्य—गुजरात जिला—सुरत तालुका—घांगनेल

गांव	सर्वे नं.	हेक्टर	प्रार.	सेन्टीयर
कीमामली	68	0	13	19
	19	0	02	00
	18/बी	0	02	00

[सं. ओ.—14016/145/83—प्रो. 4]

S.O. 1697.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of its notification objection to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Olpad

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
Kimamli	68	0	13	19
	19	0	02	00
	18/b	0	02	00

[No. O-14016/145/83-Prof.]

का. प्रा. 1698.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईपलाईन गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इन्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्द्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग प्रार सी दत्त रोड बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी बिधि व्यवसायी का मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा से बरेली में जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए  
राज्य—गुजरात जिला—सुरत तालुका—घांगनेल

गांव	सर्वे नं.	हेक्टर	प्रार.	सेन्टीयर
घामडाहे	459	0	07	20
	462/1	0	18	32
	455	0	04	80
	460	0	04	00
	493	0	33	00
	489	0	06	00
	488	0	07	00
	573/1	0	28	00
	574	0	13	64

[सं. O—14016/39/84—जी पी

S.O. 1698.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bareilly to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to be Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bareilly—Jagdishpur—Change Line  
State : Gujarat District : Surat Taluka : Mangrol

Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Are centare	Centare
Dhamadod	459	0	07	20
	462/1	0	18	32
	455	0	04	80
	460	0	04	00
	493	0	33	00
	489	0	06	00
	488	0	07	00
	573/1	0	28	00
	574	0	13	64

[No. O-14016/39/84-GP]

का. आ. 1699—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 185 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाईप लाईनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे यतः अन्वीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग आर. सी दत्ता रोड, बड़ोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजिरा से बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाईपलाइन

राज्य—गुजरात जिला—बड़ोदरा

तालुका—डभोई

गाव	ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेन्टीयर
राजली	314	0	12	16

[सं. O-14016/57/84 ओ एन जी डी-4]

S.O. 1699.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 185(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government

declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-Section (1) Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cum-branches.

## SCHEDULE

Hajira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Block No.	Area of ROU H A CA		
Rajali	314	0	12	16

[No. O-14016/57/84-ONG-D 4]

का. आ. 1700.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन भूमि में उपयोग का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 207 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार का पाइपलाइन को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः अन्वीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अन्वीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग आर. सी दत्ता रोड बड़ोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजिरा-बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : वडोदरा तालुका : डभोई

गांव	ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टर	प्रार. सेन्टीयर
परौखा	306	0	03 53
	74	0	05 90

[सं. O—14016/60/84-ओ एन जी डी-4]

S.O. 1700.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 207(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under S section 6 of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat	District : Vaddara	Taluka : Dabhoi
Village	Block No.	Area of ROU H A CA
Parikha	306	0 03 53
	74	0 05 90

[No. O-14016/60/84-ONG-D4]

कां.प्र. 1701.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का प्र.सं. 189(ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइप लाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्रारम्भ घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सलम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और अतः, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और अतः उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रोपॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि. वर्पिंग विल्डिंग, प्रार.सी. दत्त रोड, बडोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजिरा—बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : वडोदरा तालुका : डभोई

गांव	सर्वेक्षण नम्बर	हे.	प्रार.	सेन्टीयर
क डधरापुरा	61	0	41	76

[सं. O-14016/62/84-ओ.एन.जी.डी.-4]

S.O. 1701.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 189(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Survey No.	Area of ROU H A CA
Kaddharapura	61	0 41 76

[No. O-14016/62/84-ONG-D-4]

का.प्र. 1702.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का.प्र.सं. 201(ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने का बजाय गैस प्रोपेर्टी प्राफ इंडिया लि. वर्ण बिल्डिंग, आर.सी. दत्त रोड, बडोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजिरा से बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन				
राज्य : गुजरात		जिला : बडोदरा		तालुका : डभोई
गांव	ब्लॉक	ए.	घार.	सेन्टीयर
अबदालपुरा	107	0	50	48

[सं. O-14016/67/84 प्रो एन जीडी-4]

S.O. 1702.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 201(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijaipur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Block No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Abadalapura	107	0	50	48

[No. O-14016/67/84-ONG-D4]

का.प्र. 1703— यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का.प्र.सं. 188 ई तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार की पाइप लाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रोपेर्टी प्राफ इंडिया लि. वर्ण बिल्डिंग, आर.सी. दत्त रोड, बडोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजिरा—सिंगापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : बडोदरा तालुका : डभोई

गांव	ब्लॉक	है.	घार.	सेन्टीयर
कामाबहोरन	493	0	25	30

[सं. O-14016/70/84-प्रो एन जीडी-4]

S.O. 1703.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 188(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cum-brances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijaipur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Survey No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Kayavarohan	493	0	25	30

[No. O-14016/70/84-ONG-D-4]

का.आ. 1704.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का.आ. सं. 195 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्राणय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्र सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइप लाइन बिछाने के आयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रोद्योगिकी ग्राफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर.सी. वत्त रोड, बडोदरा, सभी बांधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

हजिरा से बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

गांव	ब्लॉक नं.	हैक्टर	घ.आ.	सेन्टीयर
सैजपुर	244	0	06	56

[सं. O-14016/74/84-ओ एन जी -डी 4]

S.O. 1704.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 195(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cum-brances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijaipur—Jagdishpur pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Block No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Sejpara	244	0	06	56

[No. O-14016/74/84-ONG-D-4]

का. आ. 1705.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का.आ. सं. 187(ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्राणय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रोद्योगिकी ग्राफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर.सी. वत्त रोड, बडोदरा, सभी बांधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा से बिलासपुर से जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : वडोदरा तालुका : डभोई।

गाँव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर और सेंटीयर
थुवावी	713	0-10-48
	749	0-01-14
	748	0-02-40

[सं० O-14016/76/84-ओएनजी-डी-4]

S.O. 1705.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 187(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Survey No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Thuwavi	713	0	10	48
	749	0	01	14
	748	0	02	40

[No. O-14016/76/84-ONG-D-4]

का० प्रा० 1706 —यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अबः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रस्तुत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप मसम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० वर्णन बिल्डिंग, न्यार० सी० दत्त राड, बडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसी आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पाईप लाईन

राज्य : गुजरात

जिला : पंचमहाल तालुका : हालोल

गाँव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टेयर	आर.	सेंटीयर
वासेंटी	93	0	09	20

[सं० O-14016/270/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1706.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Halol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare		
		Are.	Centi-	are
Vasenti	93	0	09	20

[No. O-14016/270/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1707.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अबः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रस्तुत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप मसम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी आफ

इण्डिया लि०, उपेण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० वस्त रोड, बडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

हजीरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पाईप लाईन

राज्य . गुजरात		जिला . पंचमहल	तालुका . बालोन	
गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	आर	सेंटीयर
ईराल	502/2	0	20	60

[सं० O-14016/373/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1707.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Kalol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Eral	502/2	0	20	60

[No. O-14016/373/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1708—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवन्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप मक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि०, उपेण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० वस्त रोड, बडोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

हजीरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पाईप लाइन

राज्य . गुजरात	जिल्ला : पंचमहल		ताल्लुका : देवगढ़ बारीया	
गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	आर	सेण्टियर
रातडीया	52	0	18	00

[सं० O-14016/439/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1708.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : D'Baria

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Ratadia	52	0	18	00

[No. O-14016/439/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1709—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय



सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इण्डिया लि०, वर्पण बिल्डिंग, फ़ार० सी० दस्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिवृद्धता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पाईप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : पंचमहल तालुका : हालोल

गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	घार	सेण्टियर
ईटपाडी	6/3	0	27	60
	50/3	0	25	65

[सं० O-14016/455/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1709.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building, R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Halol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Cent-tiare
Itwadi	6/3	0	27	60
	50/3	0	25	65

[No. O-14016/455/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1710.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

477 GI/87-6

यतः प्रब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इण्डिया लि०, वर्पण बिल्डिंग, फ़ार० सी० दस्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिवृद्धता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पाईप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : पंचमहल तालुका : कालोल

गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	घार	सेण्टियर
सालीयाव	89/P	0	27	00
	88	0	04	00

[सं० O-14016/458/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1710.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

Andwhereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Kalol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Cent-tiare
Saliyav	89/P	0	27	00
	88	0	04	00

[No. O-14016/458/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1711.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी ऑफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी साईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्वलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बरातें कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप मध्यम प्राधिकारी गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि०, दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजिरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पार्श्व लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात	ज़िला : पंचमहल	तालुका : दाहोद		
गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	आर	सेण्टियर
गमला	147/2	0	24	94

[सं० O 14016/467/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1711.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building, R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Dahod

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Gamla	147/2	0	24	94

[No. O-14016/467/84-GP]

का० आ० 1712—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि भोक्ता में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजिरा-बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पार्श्वलाइन गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी साईना को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्वलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बरातें कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप मध्यम प्राधिकारी गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इण्डिया लि०, दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजिरा-बीजापुर-जगदीशपुर पार्श्व लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : पंचमहल तालुका : लीमखेडा

गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टर	आर	सेण्टियर
पाटवान	61/P	0	03	00

[सं० O 14016-472/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1712.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein ;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building, R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Limkheda

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Patvan	61/P	0	03	00

[No. O-14016/467/84-GP]

का० प्रा० 1713—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित से यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा—बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस प्राथारिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्प्राबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद् कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस प्राथारिटी आफ इण्डिया लि०, दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कबन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा—बीजापुर—जगदीशपुर पाईप लाइन

राज्य : गुजरात जिला पंचमहल तालुका : कालोल

गांव	सर्वे नम्बर	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेण्टीयर
भुखी	319	0	01	00

[सं० -14016/513/84-जीपी]

S.O. 1713.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State Pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd, Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur:

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Kalol

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Bhukhi	319	0	01	00

[No. O-14016/513/84-GP]

का प्रा० 1714—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित से यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा—बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन गैस प्राथारिटी आफ इण्डिया लि० द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्प्राबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद् कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस प्राथारिटी आफ इण्डिया लि०, दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर० सी० दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कबन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा—बीजापुर—जगदीशपुर पाईप लाइन

राज्य—गुजरात, जिला—पंचमहल, तालुका देवगढ जारिया

गांव	सर्वे नं.	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेण्टीयर
रोहापानी	184	0	04	32

[सं० O—14016/47/85—जीपी]

S.O. 1714.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd, Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

## SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : D'Baria

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Richhwani	189	0	04	32

[No. O-14016/47/85-GP]

का. भा. 1715.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा—बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस प्राथोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बसते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए प्राक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस प्राथोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. वर्पण बिल्डिंग, प्रार. सी. वस्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा प्राक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा—बीजापुर—जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य—गुजरात, जिला—पंचमहल, तालुका—लीमखेडा

गांव	सर्वे नंबर	हेक्टेयर	भार	सेन्टीयर
राई	2	0	12	15
	42	0	03	89
	43	0	06	32
	339/पी	0	25	00
	339/पी	0	10	00
	325/पी	0	46	00
	325/पी	0	30	00
	352	0	06	00
	354	0	35	00

[सं. O—14016/68/85—ओ पी]

S.O. 1715.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.,

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Limkheda

Village	Survey No.	Hec-taro	Arc.	Cent-tiare
Rai	2	0	12	15
	42	0	03	89
	43	0	06	32
	339/P	0	25	00
	339/P	0	10	00
	325/P	0	46	00
	325/P	0	30	00
	352	0	06	00
	354	0	35	00

[No. O-14016/68/85-GP]

का. भा. 1716.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा—बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन गैस प्राथोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बसते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए प्राक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गैस प्राथोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. वर्पण बिल्डिंग, प्रार. सी. वस्त रोड, बड़ोदरा को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा प्राक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा—बीजापुर—जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य—गुजरात, जिला—पंचमहल, तालुका—लीमखेडा

गांव	सर्वे नंबर	हेक्टेयर	भार	सेन्टीयर
	60	0	09	85
	81/पी	0	63	72
	81/पी	0	33	30
	84	0	21	04

[सं. O—14016/470/85—ओ पी]

S.O. 1716.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hajira-Bijapur to Jagdishpur in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Gas Authority of India Ltd.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the lying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Gas Authority of India Ltd. Darpan Building R. C. Dutt Road, Vadodara-5.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hazira—Bijaipur—Jagdishpur  
State : Gujarat District : Panchmahal Taluka : Limkheda

Villa De	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are.	Centiare
Amba	60	0	09	85
	81/P	0	63	72
	81//P	0	33	30
	84	0	21	04

[No. O—14016-470/85-GP]

का. आ. 1717.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 194 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रायोरिटी आफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा से बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य.—गुजरात, जिला.—बड़ोदरा, तालुका करजन

गांव	सर्वे न.	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेन्टीयर
सागडोल	273	0	30	00

[सं. O—14016/489/85—जो पी]

S.O. 1717.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 194(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land)

Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. free from all encumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira Bijaipur Jagdishpur Pipeline  
State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan

Village	Survey No	Area of ROU H A CA		
Sagdol	273	0	30	00

[No. O—14016-489/85-GP]

का. आ. 1718.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 206 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रायोरिटी आफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर

राज्य :—गुजरात, जिला :—वडोदरा, तालुका :—करजन

गांव	सर्वे नं.	हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेन्टीयर
मालोद	6	0	01	00
	5	0	08	00
	29/7	0	11	00
	38	0	02	50

[सं. 0—14016/490/85-जी पी]

S.O. 1718.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 206(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. free from all encumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira Bijaipur Jagdishpur Pipeline

State: Gujarat District: Vadodara Taluka: Karjan

Village	Survey No	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Malod	6	0	01	00
	5	0	08	00
	29/7	0	11	00
	38	0	02	50

[No. O-14016/490/85 GP]

का. धा. 1719—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. धा. सं. 204 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइन को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवक्ष्य शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रवक्ष्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्राथो-रिटी प्राक इन्डिया लि. वर्पेण लिमिटेड, आर. सी. दत्त रोड, वडोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से धोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

हजीरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य :—गुजरात, जिला :—वडोदरा, तालुका :—करजन

गांव	ब्लॉक नं.	हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेन्टीयर
मोटीकोरल	287	0	17	70
	288	0	16	12
	292	0	03	40
	293	0	07	93
	294	0	02	35
	307	0	10	85

[सं. 0—14016/493/85—जी पी]

S.O. 1719.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 204(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. free from all encumbrances.

## SCHEDULE

Hazira Bijaipur Jagdishpur Pipeline

State: Gujarat District: Vadodara Taluka: Karjan

Village	Block No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Moti Koral	287	0	17	70
	288	0	16	12
	292	0	03	40
	293	0	07	93
	294	0	02	35
	307	0	10	85

[No. O-14016/493/85 GP]

क. प्रा. 1720—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. स. 199 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाईनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रायोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, भार. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाईप लाईन

राज्य:—गुजरात, जिला:—बड़ोदरा, तालुका:—करजन

गांव	सर्वे न.	हेक्टर	घारे	सेन्टीयर
करोना	260	0	21	40
	259	0	03	60
	268	0	03	20
	57	0	13	20

[सं. O—14016/505/85—जी पी]

S.O. 1720.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 199(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. encumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline  
State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan

Village	Survey No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Kahona	260	0	21	40
	259	0	03	60
	268	0	03	20
	57	0	13	20

[No. O-14016/505/85 GP]

का. प्रा. 1721.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 197 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचनाओं से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाईनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अब, सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्रायोरिटी प्राफ इन्डिया लि. दर्पण बिल्डिंग, भार. सी. दत्त रोड, बड़ोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

#### अनुसूची

हजीरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर तक पाईप लाईन

राज्य:—गुजरात, जिला:—बड़ोदरा, तालुका:—करजन

गांव	ब्लॉक न.	हेक्टर	घारे	सेन्टीयर
आलमपुर	164	0	10	50
	147	0	00	30

[सं. O—14016/509/85—जी. पी.]

S.O. 1721.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 197(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline ;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the appended to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central

Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline ;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of the declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. encumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan				
Village	Block No	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Alampur	164	0	10	50
	147	0	00	30

[No. O-14016/509/85-GP]

का. प्रा. 1722.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का प्रजनन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. प्रा. सं. 200 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्राण्य घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्राथोरिटी प्रांफ इन्डिया लि., वर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्ता, रोड, बडोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची]

हजिरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइप लाइन

राज्य:—गुजरात, जिला:—बडोदरा, तालुका:—करजन

गांव	खेती नं.	हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेन्टीयर
फतेपुर	काटे ट्रेक	0	09	00

[सं. O—14016/513/85-जी पी]

S.O. 1722.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 200(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline ;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section(1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline ;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. encumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan

Village	Survey No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Fatepur	Cart Track	0	09	00

[No. O-14016/513/85-GP]

का. प्रा. 1723.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का प्रजनन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. प्रा. सं. 196 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्राण्य घोषित कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस प्राथोरिटी प्रांफ इन्डिया लि., वर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर. सी. दत्ता रोड, बडोदरा, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख को निहित होगा ;

अनुसूची

हजिरा से बीजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन

राज्य:—गुजरात जिला:—बडोदरा तालुका:—करजन

गांव	ब्लॉक	रे. आर. सेन्टीयर
बकापुर	75	0-01-60

[सं. O-14016/515/85 जी. पी.]

S.O. 1723.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 196(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in



Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances.

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan

Village	Block No.	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Bakapur	75	0	01	60

[No. O-14016/515/85-GP]

का. आ. 1724 :—यह पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के उर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 202 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यह केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस ऑथोरिटी आफ इंडिया लि., दर्पण बिन्दिग, आर. सी. दम रोड, बडोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख का निश्चित होगा।

अनुसूची

हजीरा में बियासपुर से जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन

राज्य—गुजरात

जिला—बडोदरा—तालुका—करजन

गांव	सर्वे. नं.	ए. आर. सेंटीयर
सीगदी	93	0-19-20
	716	0-26-80

[सं. O.-14016/516/85—जी. पी.]

S.O. 1724—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 202 (E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. cumbrances

#### SCHEDULE

Hazira—Bijapur—Jagdishpur Pipeline

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Karjan

Village	Survey No	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Simoli	93	0	19	20
	746	0	26	80

[No. O-14016/516/85-GP]

का. आ. 1725 :—यह पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के उर्जा मंत्रालय पेट्रोलियम विभाग की अधिसूचना का. आ. सं. 203 (ई) तारीख 11-3-87 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइपलाइनों को बिछाने के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और यह सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यह केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाय गैस ऑथोरिटी आफ इंडिया लि., दर्पण बिन्दिग, आर. सी. दम रोड, बडोदरा सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन कि इस तारीख को निश्चित होगा।

अनुसूची		
हजीरा से बिजापुर से जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन		
राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—वडोदरा	तालुका—करजन
गांव	सर्वे. नं.	ऐ. मार. मेन्टीयर
बेरोली	141/9	0-06-22
	176	0-05-00
	25	0-30-60
	26	0-31-20
	27	0-28-20

[सं. O—14016/519/85-जी. पी.]

S.O. 1725.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum S.O. 203(E) dated 11-3-87 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the appended to this notification;

Now therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in Central Government vests on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Gas Authority of India Ltd. as donees.

## SCHEDULE

Hajira-Bijapur-Jagdispur Pipeline				
State : Gujarat District : Vadodara		Taluka : Karjan		
Village	Survey No	Area of ROU		
		H	A	CA
Dholi	141/9	0	06	22
	176	0	05	00
	25	0	30	60
	26	0	31	20
	27	0	28	20

[No. O-14016/519/85-GP]

## शुद्धिपत्र

का. आ. 1726—भारत का राजपत्र दिनांक 7-9-85 के भाग-2 खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (ii) में पृष्ठ संख्या 4692 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की खनिज पाइप लाइन के (भूमि के अधिकार का अर्जन) खनिज एवं पेट्रोलियम अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 6(1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 4146 दिनांक 23-8-85 ग्राम असेनी परगना विधुना तहसील विधुना जिला—इटावा की प्रकाशित सूची के स्तम्भ 5 व 6 में गांदा संख्या 947 क्षेत्रफल 0.11 एकड़ के स्थान पर गांदा संख्या 947 क्षेत्रफल 0.20 एकड़ पढ़ा जाय।

[सं. O-14016/7/84-जी पी]

## CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 1726.—In the Gazette notification of India, Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) No. S.O. 4146 dated 23-8-85 in village Aseni, Pargana & Tehsil-Vidhuna District-

Etawah published on 7-9-85 at pages 4693 in vol. 2 part 3 (ii) under sub-section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum & Minerals Pipeline (Acquisition of right of user, in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), in column 5 & 6 be read plot No. 947 area 0.02 acre instead of plot No. 947 area 0.11 in schedule.

[No. 14016/7/84-GP]

## शुद्धिपत्र

का. आ. 1727—भारत का राजपत्र दिनांक 7-9-85 के भाग 2 खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (ii) में पृष्ठ संख्या 4690 व 4691 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की खनिज पाइप लाइन के (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) खनिज एवं पेट्रोलियम अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 6(1) के अधीन ग्राम गुलरिहो परगना—विधुना तहसील विधुना जिला इटावा की जारी अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 4144 दिनांक 23-8-85 की प्रकाशित सूची के स्तम्भ 5 व 6 में निम्न प्रकार पढ़ा जाय।

पूर्व प्रकाशित		अब जो पढ़ा जायेगा	
5	6	5	6
193	0.28	193	0.50
203	0.70	203	0.32
204	0.01	204	0.39
235	0.01	235	0.11

[सं. O—14016/5/85-जी पी]

सक्षम प्राधिकारी

भारतीय गैस प्राधिकरण लि. लखनऊ

राकेश कक्कर, उप सचिव

## CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 1727—In the Gazette of India, Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) No. S.O. 4144 dated 23-8-85 in village Gulriha Pargana & Tehsil Vidhuna District-Etawah published on 7-9-85 at pages 4691 in vol-2 part-3 (ii) under section (i) of section 6 of the petroleum & Mineral pipeline (Acquisition of right of user in land) Petroleum & Mineral Act 1962 (50 of 1962) in column 5 & 6 be read as follows :

Already published		To be substituted	
5	6	5	6
193	0.28	193	0.50
203	0.70	203	0.32
204	0.01	204	0.39
235	0.01	235	0.11

[No. O-14016/5/85-GP]

Competent Authority

Gas Authority of India Limited

Lucknow.

RAKESH KAKKAR, Dy. Secy.

## संचार मंत्रालय

(दूरसंचार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1728—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 ने नियम 434 के खंड iii के पैरा (क) के अनुसार महानिदेशक, दूरसंचार विभाग ने मुम्बई टेलीफोन केंद्र, समिलनाटु सफिल, में दिनांक 1-7-1987 में प्रमाणित कर प्रणाली लागू करने का निर्देश किया है।

[संख्या 5-3/87-पी एच की]

## MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(Department of Telecommunications)

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1987

S.O. 1728.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Department of Telecommunications hereby specifies 1-7-1987 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Mukkudal Telephone Exchange, Tamil Nadu Telecom. Circle.

[No. 5—3/87-PHB]

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1728—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार महाविदेशक, दूरसंचार विभाग ने मेडाघाट टेलीफोन केन्द्र, मध्य प्रदेश सर्किल, में दिनांक 4-7-1987 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने के निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-7/87-पी एच बी]

पी. आर. काररा, महायक महाविदेशक (पी. एच. बी.)

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1987

S.O. 1729.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Department of Telecommunications, hereby specifies 4th July, 1987 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Bheraghat Telephone Exchange, M.P. Telecom. Circle.

[No. 5—7/87-PHB]

P. R. KARRA, Asstt. Director Genl. (PHB)

## श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 22 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1730.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (VI) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 86 दिनांक 24 दिसम्बर, 1986 द्वारा बैंकिंग उद्योग को जो उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2 के खंड (खख) में यथा-परिभाषित बैंकिंग कंपनी द्वारा चलाया जाता है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 29 दिसम्बर, 1986 से छ मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छ मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (VI) के परन्तुक द्वारा तयों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 29 जून, 1987 से छ मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम-11017/2/85-डी-1 (ए)]

नन्द लाल, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1987

S.O. 1730.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 86 dated the 24th December, 1987 the Banking Industry carried on by a Bank-

ing Company as defined in clause (bb) of section 2 of the said Act to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for period of six months from the 29th December, 1987.

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 29th June, 1987.

[No. S-11017/2/85-D.I(A)]

NAND LAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1987

का. आ. 1731.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1987

S.O. 1731.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(58)/1984

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Kingsway, Nagpur, and their workman, Ku. S. D. Konde, Clerk, represented through the SBI & Subsidiary Banks Employees Union, Ajmeri House, Surana Layout, Opposite Tidke Vidyalaya, Katol Road, Chhaoni, Nagpur (MS).

## APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri S. D. Phadke.

For Management.—Shri A. K. Ramani, Asstt. Law Officer.

INDUSTRY : Banking. DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.).  
AWARD

Dated : June, 4th 1987

By Notification No. L-12012/1/84-D II(A) dated 17th July, 1984, Central Government in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred the following dispute, for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Nagpur in relation to their Amravati Branch in terminating the services of Ku. S. D. Konde, Clerk in violation of the provisions of Sec. 25-G of the I.D. Act and para 20.8 of the Binartite Settlement is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?”

2. Non-controversial facts of the case are that the workman was working with the State Bank of India at Amravati Branch as shown in Annexure Ex M/2 from—

(a) 12-5-1971 to 8-4-1972

(b) 19-9-1975 to 18-10-1975

3. The case of the workwoman further is that she worked continuously in the above period. Management turned down her request dated 31-8-1982 to absorb her vide their letter dated 19-10-1982 though junior employees to the workman viz. Shri A. M. Khandekar and Shri M. K. Joshi were allowed to continue their temporary service and new persons & juniors to her were appointed viz. S/Shri R. S. Vyas, K. G. Ingole, V. V. Dhake, Ku. Khaparde, Khajurkui and several others in violation of Clause 25G of the Industrial Disputes Act (hereinafter referred to as the Act) and Rule 'Last come First Go'. The workwoman had completed service of 266 days in the Bank. Management has, therefore, also violated the provisions of Section 25F, 25D and 25H of the Act and paras 483 and 508(C) of the Sastry Award. There was a clear vacancy at Amravati Branch as is apparent from the letter of the Branch Manager dated 19-1-1972 which goes to show that he had also appointed Shri A. M. Khandekar as temporary clerk for three months in place of Shri D. A. Moharker another temporary clerk as he had completed 8½ months temporary service and also he had asked the Head office to post a few more clerks. Similar other letters also go to show that the Head Office had confirmed the illegal act of the Branch Manager, i.e. unfair labour practice and contravention of Sec. 25G of the Act.

4. The workman was not given any notice or wages in lieu of notice and the compensation. The temporary employees were replaced by new temporary ones in violation of Sec. 25-G and 25-H of the Act. It is not true that all the employees junior to her were appointed in leave vacancy. No intimation was given to the workwoman in accordance with the provisions of rules No. 76 to 78 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the Rules).

5. The case of the management is that the workwoman worked for 192 days only and not for over 266 days as alleged by the workwoman. She was also granted leave for 7 days with loss of pay and she worked not continuously but intermittently. She was given an appointment as temporary clerk at Amravati with effect from 12-5-1971 initially for a period of one month only (Ex. M11). Her services were governed by the Sastry Award and not by the Bombay Shops and Establishments Act. Shri M. K. Joshi was appointed with effect from 15-11-1971 and his services were terminated on 30-6-1972. However, from 9-3-1972 he worked as Godown Keeper altogether in different category and his appointment was during the continuation of the service of the present workwoman. Shri Khandekar worked continuously with the workwoman from 18-5-1971 to 31-8-1972. These workmen were working in leave vacancy and it was not practical to synchronise period of their appointment and termination. Section 25-D has no application because she was not laid off but terminated. The present reference has been referred to this Tribunal on 17-7-1984 and amendment regarding unfair labour practice came into force much later. Therefore this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the new plea of unfair labour practice mentioned in the Fifth Schedule of the Act. Further more Shri R. S. Vyas, Shri K. G. Ingole, Shri V. V. Dahake and Ku. Kharde were appointed as temporary employee and their services were already terminated on 31-8-1972, 4-1-1974 and 30-4-1974 respectively. Further more all these employees failed to qualify the test of permanent appointment including the workwoman who appeared for such test on two occasions. Therefore she was not taken up in permanent posts. Shri Khajurkui, however, qualified the test for permanent appointment and was taken in permanent vacancy. The provisions of Section 25-B, 25-D, 25-F, 25-G and 25-H have not been contravened. In any case, this dispute has been raised after a lapse of about 12 years, as such very much belated. Therefore the claim is liable to be dismissed for undue lapses and latches. She has been recently employed in Polytechnic College for which a certificate is being filed. Therefore she is not entitled to any back wages etc., in any case.

6. I have already reproduced above the Schedule to the reference. I will consider the contention raised by the Union on behalf of the workwoman in view of the above Schedule.

7. Learned Counsel for the Union did not point out in his written arguments the relevant provision of para 20.8 of

Bipartite Settlement or pleaded the same which is alleged to have been violated. It therefore appears to be only a typing error, and as such redundant. In its written arguments learned representative has pointed out that the management contravened various provisions of Section 25 of the Act.

8. The contention of the management is that except for the contravention of Sec. 25-G this Court/Tribunal cannot consider the contravention of any other provisions of Sec. 25 or any Rules or any other act since the reference as it has been made does not empower this Tribunal to do so. The reference only mentions the violation of Sec. 25-G and para 20.8 (only a typing error) of the Bipartite Settlement. I am of the opinion that the contention of the management has some force. Law on the point is now well settled. The Tribunal must confine its adjudication to points of dispute and the matter incidental thereto under Sec. 10(4) of the Act. Jurisdiction on the Tribunal is conferred from the terms of dispute mentioned in the order of reference. The order of reference being the operational basis, therefore jurisdiction is confined to the actual points of dispute on the terms of reference i.e. the matter substantially involved or connected with the dispute referred to it. In this regard perhaps the Union feels that the other provisions of Sec. 25 relied on by them may amount to matter incidental thereto. But I am unable to agree. Matters which require independent consideration and treatment and have their own importance cannot be considered incidental. The dispute is fundamental things while something incidental thereto is an adjunct to it. Something incidental, therefore, cannot cut at the root of the main thing to which it is adjunct (Delhi Cloth and General Mills Co. Vs. Workmen (1967) 1 SCR 882). Similarly in the case of M/s. Firestone Tyre and Rubber Co. V. Workmen (1981-II-LLJ 218) it has been laid down—

"Therein the only question referred for adjudication was whether certain workmen should be reinstated. The demand for reinstatement as made arose on the alleged invalidity of the action taken by the management in dismissing the concerned workmen. The issue of unfair labour practice or discrimination by reason of subsequent reinstatement on a permanent basis of some and not all the workmen was not a matter referred to the Tribunal for adjudication, nor could it be said to be in any way connected with or incidental to the right of reinstatement claimed by the dismissed workmen from the date of dismissal. The fairness or subsequent absorption of some workmen was a matter irrelevant for judging the validity of the earlier dismissal of the concerned workmen along with others; it was entirely a separate and independent question. To record a finding of unfair labour practice and discrimination is to travel outside the jurisdiction."

Therefore I am of the opinion that it is beyond the scope of this reference to consider the other provisions of Sec. 25 of the Act or any other act and rules except Sec. 25-G and the provisions incidental thereto. However, to be exhaustive I will briefly touch the various provisions relied on by the Union. As far Section 25-B and 25-F are concerned the number of days the workwoman worked with the management are relevant. The management has filed Annexure M-2 to prove the number of days that the workwoman worked with the management i.e. the number of days actually worked :—

192 days plus 34 Sundays plus 11 holidays (excluding 7 days leave with loss of pay).

On the other hand, Union relied on Ex. W11, the authenticity of which has not been proved by any reliable evidence. In view of this matter even the Union representative had conceded as correct in their written argument the position mentioned in Annexure M-2.

9. The question arises whether the leave with loss of pay and the leave admissible as per various awards are to be taken into account to count 240 days. I am of the opinion that such leave though admissible but not enjoyed cannot be taken into consideration. She appears to have taken 7 days leave at the time when she was not entitled to any leave. For the purpose of Sec. 25-B only authorised leave

availed can be taken into consideration. Even the cessation of work which is not due to any fault of the workman can only be taken into account. I am, therefore, of the opinion that provision of Sec. 25-B and Sec. 25-F do not come to the rescue of the workwoman because she had not completed 240 days in the preceding year. In the preceding year, i.e. 1972 the workwoman had only put in 99 days or at the most 137 days service.

10. It is not a case of laid off. Therefore Sec. 25-D has no application. Sec. 25-H is incidental to the provisions of Sec. 25-G which embodies the Rule of "Last come First go" and which is the subject matter of reference to this Tribunal, therefore, it will be considered presently. The question of unfair labour practice is also not the subject matter of reference. Therefore I need not consider that aspect of the matter.

11. As far as Sec. 25-G and the provisions incidental thereto i.e. Sec. 25-H of the Act and Rules 76 to 78 of Rules 1957 are concerned, I find that the workwoman in her pleadings had named so many persons but at the stage of arguments only pressed the name of Ku. Kaparde as her junior. Therefore on facts the C.G.I.T. No. 1, Bombay case of A. A. Hirani (Ref. 33 of 1981 decided on 20th October, 1982) does not help the workwoman.

12. It is the case of the management that the workers who had worked simultaneously or subsequently to the workwoman had failed in the test and therefore they were not re-employed except one Mr. Khajurkar who had qualified in the test. But this Mr. Khajurkar according to Ku. Konde refused to join. Thus the net result is that none of those workers either worked as fresh candidates or juniors to the workwoman are in employment any longer. If at all they worked only as badli workers for certain fixed periods and their services came to an end on the expiration of the fixed period or after having failed in the test like the workwoman. In this connection, it is to be noted that the workwoman admittedly worked from 12-5-1971 to 9-4-1974 intermittently in the first lap and continuously from 19-9-1975 to 18-10-1975 in the second lap. It is the case of the management that all these workmen worked in leave vacancy which fact is borne out from their nature and period of their employment shown in the documents filed by the management.

13. In this connection, it is pertinent to note the statement of the workwoman herself. She has herself stated that she had appeared in recruitment test in the year 1973 and thereafter also i.e. on two occasions but she should not get her result. That means she failed. Therefore if she failed in the recruitment test in the year 1973 and thereafter also she is not entitled to be re-employed as worker. In view of this matter the stand taken up by Ku. S. D. Konde (WW-1) in her statement is that some persons like Shri Khajurkar and Miss Kaparde were offered recruitment test in the year 1981 and 1982 but she was not called. Earlier also she had appeared in response to the advertisement and not that the department had given her an opportunity. As far as the second limb of the contention is concerned, it makes no difference whether she appeared in response to the advertisement or she was called by the department. Fact remains that she got an opportunity to qualify but she failed. As far as the first of the contention is concerned, she has no knowledge whether Mr. Khajurkar or Miss Kaparde had appeared earlier in two tests or not. Therefore if they were called in the tests held in 1981 and 1982 it does not infringe the provision of Sec. 25-G of the Act. Any way like other workers she also once again got an opportunity of working as badli worker in the year 1975. In view of my findings above I am of the opinion that the principle of 'Last come first go' and the provisions of S. 25-G or S. 25-H have not been violated. In the circumstances, violation of any of Rule 76 to 78 of I. D. (Central) Rules do not entitle the workwoman to be reinstated. She had failed in the competitive test and therefore if she is ordered to be reinstated it will amount to putting incompetent person over and above the competent ones. In view of the above, I answer the reference as under :—

in terminating the services of Ku. S. D. Konde, Clerk, is justified since the management has not violated the provisions of Sec. 25-G of I. D. Act or Bipartite Settlement.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012/1/84-D.II (A)]

का. आ. 1732.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नई दिल्ली, के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1732.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 109/78

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri D. R. Lakhani, Clerk

Versus

The Chief General Manager, State Bank of India,  
Parliament Street, New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri J. N. Kapoor—for the workman.

Shri V. K. Gupta—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/15/78-D.II (A) dated 5/13-12-78 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India in dismissing Shri D. R. Lakhani, Clerk, Local Head Office of the Bank in New Delhi from the Banks Service with effect from 30th April, 1976 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman entitled?"

2. As this reference is being decided on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties, it is not considered necessary to set forth in detail the respective pleadings of the parties. Suffice it to say that the workman was employed with the State Bank of India in its Head Office at New Delhi and his services were terminated w.e.f. 30-4-76 on the basis of the charge sheet served upon him and a domestic enquiry conducted against him on the said charges. The workman challenged his termination on the ground that the enquiry against him was not fair and proper and was vitiated for the various reasons mentioned in his statement of claim. The Management justified its action and defended the domestic enquiry held against the workman as fair and proper.

3. The following issues were settled on 30-10-80,

1. Whether the enquiry is vitiated.

2. As in the order of reference.

4. Parties did not produce any evidence and took all this time in negotiating the settlement. Today parties have filed a written settlement Ex. 'X'. The statement of the workman and the representative of the Management have also been recorded. In terms of the settlement Ex. 'X' the services of the workman shall be deemed to have been terminated w.e.f. 22-5-87 and he shall be paid the sum of Rs. 3,00,000 (Rupees

That the action of the management of State Bank of India, Nagpur in relation to their Amravati Branch

three lacs only) is full and final settlement of all his claims and dues. The workman shall have no further claim whatsoever against the Management. Similarly the Management will have no claim whatsoever against the workman. The settlement Ex. 'X' shall form a part of this award. This reference is disposed of accordingly.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this award may be forwarded to the Central Government for necessary action at their end.

Dated : 22nd May, 1987.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012/15/78-D.II (A)]

#### MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

Name of Parties representing employer—SBI is being represented by the personnel Manager.

Representing workman—Shri D. R. Lakhani represented by the President SBI Staff Association.

#### Short Recital of the case

#### Whereas :

- (a) the workman in I. D. No. 109 of 1978 had raised the Industrial Dispute, about his termination of services by the Bank.
- (b) the matter under settlement is pending before the Central Industrial Tribunal for a long time.
- (c) The parties for maintaining the Industrial peace and harmony, have been trying to arrive at a settlement.
- (d) The parties to the settlement have agreed voluntarily on the following terms and conditions which are beneficial to both the parties.
- (e) The parties further agree this settlement shall be binding on them and that the settlement shall be filed with the appropriate authorities as required by Rule 58 of the I. D. (Central Rules 1957).
- (f) Now it is hereby agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows :
  - (i) That the management of SBI shall pay a lumpsum Compensation of Rs. 3,00,000 (Rupees three lacs only) to the workman Shri D. R. Lakhani in full and final settlement of all his claims including re-employment with the bank, the workman hereby gives up the right to claim re-employment with the Bank.
  - (ii) That the services of workman from the bank shall be deemed as terminated with effect from 22-5-1987 for all intents and purposes.
  - (iii) That the workman on receipt of Rs. 3,00,000 (Rupees Three lacs only) shall not have any dispute about his salary, including of back-wages and future wages, re-employment dismissal, P.F. (including own contribution of the workman) Gratuity, retrenchment, compensation, medical benefits, bonus, pension LFC and leave encashment, etc.

The amount of settlement has been fixed with the mutual consent of the workman and the management at Rs. 3 Lakhs. This figure has been arrived at with the mutual consent and understanding arrived at between the parties in the following manner :—

Year	Gross Salary Payable due if reinstated	Subsistence allowance already paid	Mutually settled amount to be paid	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1973-74	8590	4295	4295	The amount
1974-75	10,870	5435	5435	already paid as
1975-76	12,440	6220	6220	subsistence allowance shall be treated as payment

1	2	3	4	5
				against this settlement.
1976-77	12730		8000	" The
1977-78	14380		10000	amounts indicated at is the
1978-79	17080	—	10000	amount agreed
1979-80	19820	—	15000	to be paid on
1980-81	22800		17000	account of
1981-82	25830	—	25000	aforesaid
1982-83	29130	—	25000	settlement.
1983-84	36440	—	25000	
1984-85	41240	—	25000	
1985-86	42940	—	25000	
1986-87	45410	—	30000	

1987-88—Full salary as due for 1-4-1987 to the date of acceptance of this settlement.

Compensation for the service—Rs. 50,000.

2. In addition to the above said payments the management shall pay a sum of Rs. 35,000 as gratuity.

3. That on account of Compensation for wrongful termination shall be paid at Rs. 50,000 and this shall be for the past and future services rendered or had he been employed would have been entitled to.

4. That the management further agrees that the amount totalling to Rs. 3,00,000 shall be paid subject to sub-clause VI relating to Income Tax within two weeks from the date of settlement a failing which the workman shall be entitled to interest @ 11% from the date of execution of this agreement.

(iv) That in short the workman will have no claim against the Bank whatsoever, at present and in future as well.

(v) This settlement will come into force with effect from date hereof.

(vi) That in short the workman will have no claim against said Shri D. R. Lakhani produces an order of exemption from Income Tax Department or other appropriate order relieving the Bank to deduct the income tax or deduct tax at a lesser rate the Bank will pay the full amount under this settlement or the amount with the lesser tax deducted as the case may be.

(vii) It is further agreed by and between the parties that as per the terms of settlement both parties shall move a joint application in I. D. No. 109 of 1978 pending before C.G.I.T.D. praying for recording settlement of dispute in terms of this joint memorandum and passing the Award accordingly

#### Witness :

1. V. K. GUPTA,  
Law Officer,  
S.B.I. India,  
New Delhi.

2. R. P. SHARMA,  
Secretary,  
S.B.I. Staff Association,  
New Delhi

#### Signature of the parties :

D. R. LAKHANI,  
(Workman)

J. N. KAPUR,  
(Workman's representative)

R. C. KHANDURI,  
(Personnel Manager)  
Representing the Management of  
State Bank of India.

का.प्र. 1733—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण से, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद से केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण भुवनेश्वर के पञ्चाट की प्रकाशित कर्मी है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-6-87 को प्रेषित हुआ था।

S.O. 1733.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR  
PRESENT :

Shri R. N. Panda, M.A., LL.B.,

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

Industrial Dispute case No 3/1986 (Central)

Dated Bhubaneswar, the 22nd May, 1987

BETWEEN

The Personnel Manager, State Bank of India (L.H.O.),  
IDCO Tower, Bhubaneswar-7. . . First Party.

AND

Shri K. Prasad, Sugar Technologist, Aska Co. Op, Sugar  
Industries Limited, P. O. Nugan, Dist. Ganjam.

. . . Second Party.

APPEARANCES :

Sri Bichitrananda Das, Asst. Law Officer. . . For the  
First Party.

Sri K. Prasad. . . The workman himself.

AWARD

1. This is a reference under section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 made by the Central Government vide its Order No. L-12012/87/85-D. II(A) dated 24th January, 1986 for adjudication of the dispute mentioned in the schedule of reference which reads as follows :—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Berhampur Branch in terminating the services of Shri K. Prasad, Ex-Temporary Cashier, w.e.f. 27-7-1969 is legal and justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The case of the workman is that the Management had appointed him as a temporary Cashier with effect from 11-11-1968 and continued him in the service of the Bank till 26-7-1969. The Bank, it is stated, did not issue any written order of termination. He was simply told orally that his services were no longer required by them with effect from 27-7-1969. He was not paid any compensation. He had been approaching the authorities for providing him further opportunities to work in the Bank. But his request was never acceded to. After termination of his services, several other workmen were appointed by the Bank in similar posts in which he was earlier appointed. It is further stated that the Management preferred to maintain silence over his representations all along. After much persuasion on 5-11-1971, he could secure a letter from the Branch Manager certifying his earlier appointment in the Bank from 11-11-1968 to 26-7-1969. It is further stated that after the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Sundermonv Vrs. State Bank of India (1976-1 L.J. 478) when the Bank started entertaining the claim of the workmen who were terminated from service earlier, he had requested the Bank to consider his case since he had completed more than 240 days of continuous service in the Bank. But his request was also not acceded. He was therefore compelled to raise an Industrial Dispute. His contentions are that he had worked for 258 days and in terms

of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act he was entitled to both notice and compensation, as the termination of his service is a retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The contention of the Bank that while calculating the number of days of his employment, Sundays and Holidays have to be excluded which is contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court reported in 1985-II-L.J. 539. The termination of the services of the workman is therefore, against the provisions of law and he is entitled to reinstatement in the service with effect from 27-7-1969 with full back wages and other attendant benefits.

3. The Management's case on the other hand is that the claim of the workman is stale and is barred by limitation. A written order of termination was issued to the workman which was duly received by him. At the time of termination of his services he was paid his salary and allowances. Although the services of the workman were terminated with effect from 26th July, 1969, he only on 22nd November, 1983 after a long lapse of 14 years, made requests for re-appointment on the ground that he is a protected employee under the Industrial Disputes Act. He raised the industrial dispute before the Regional Labour Commissioner only on 4th July, 1984 almost 15 years after his temporary appointment in the Bank came to an end. The workman, it is further contended, never put in 240 days of service. After excluding intervening Sundays and other holidays, he can not be said to be completed 240 days of service and therefore, he is not entitled to benefits provided in section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Management has taken this view on the basis of Madras High Court's decision reported in 1979 Lab. I. C. 136. The judgment of the Supreme Court to which the workman relies is a later event. The Management had acted according to the position of law as it then stood. In the year 1969 the Bank could not have applied the principles of computation of 240 days decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the year 1985. The action of the First Party therefore can not be said to be invalid, inoperative and void abinitio. The workman, it is also contended, after the termination of the service has been gainfully employed continuously and permanently with the Aska Co-operative Sugar Industry Limited as a Sugar Technologist. He has apparently raised the dispute at this belated stage with a view of taking advantage of the Supreme Court decisions. This decision cannot be applied retrospectively in his case. On the question of limitation the Management has relied on a decision reported in AIR 1959 S. C. page 1217. Finally it is stated that the workman being guilty of not pursuing his claim for a period of 14 to 15 years and his claim of reinstatement does not merit any consideration.

4. At the stage of hearing, both the parties declined to adduce any oral evidence. As agreed to by the parties documents were marked on admission.

5. It appears from Exts. A to G that the workman was in the employment of the Bank from 11-11-1968 to 26-7-69. In fact this is the admitted case of both the parties. According to the Management in computing the period of the days of employment of the workman Sundays and other holidays have to be excluded and on the basis of such a computation the workman can not be said to have worked under the Management continuously for a period of 240 days. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court reported in 1985 (II) L.J. 539 the Sundays and other gazetted holidays have to be included while computing the period of employment of a workman. It is true that by the time of the termination of the services of the workman, the legal position was that the Sundays and other holidays should be excluded while computing the period of employment. But in view of the decision of the Supreme Court referred to above it is no longer open to the Management to contend that the Sundays and other holidays should be excluded from consideration. In a pending dispute the present position of law has to be applied. The Management's contention therefore that the workman did not work continuously for 240 days can not be accented. The workman admittedly worked under the Management from 11-11-1968 to 26-7-1969 and the number of days of employment comes to 258 days. The termination of the services of this workman was clearly a retrenchment and the workman was entitled to the benefits provided in section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. Admittedly, the Management has not complied with the

provision of section 25-F and in that view of the matter the termination of the services of the workman can not be said to be valid in the eye of law.

6. The next question that arises for consideration is whether the workman is entitled to any relief. It has been submitted on behalf of the Management that the claim of the workman for reinstatement and for payment of back wages, is stale and barred by limitation. In this connection reliance has been placed on a decision reported in AIR 1959 S. C. Page 1217 wherein their Lordships have held :

"It is true that there is no limitation prescribed for reference of dispute to an Industrial Tribunal, even so it is only reasonable that disputes should be referred as soon as possible after they have arisen ..... particularly so when dispute relate to discharge of workmen wholesale. But where none of the workers did it for almost three years when the first reference was made the Tribunal was justified in refusing the relief of reinstatement."

7. This is a case where termination is said to have been taken place in July, 1969. The workman claims to have made representation to the Management soon after the termination of his services. His further case is that the Management slept over his representation and finally he was able to get a reply from the Management with regard to the period of his employment in the year 1984. There is no evidence either oral or documentary to show that the workman made any representation to the Management for his reinstatement. This is therefore, a case where the workman felt it wise not to raise any dispute regarding the order of termination for quite a long period. The Management's case is that the workman after the termination of his services by the Bank took up employment under the Sugar factory as a Sugar Technologist. This part of the Management's case has not been refuted by the workman either by a rejoinder or by any evidence. It appears to me that having taken up another employment which may be more lucrative the workman preferred to remain silent over the matter. The Management during all these years has made other appointments and to direct reinstatement of the workman at this stage would mean only dislocation in the business of the Bank. Taking all these facts and circumstances into consideration I am not inclined to allow reinstatement of the workman in the services of the Bank.

8. As to the back wages the Management's case is that the workman has been gainfully employed during all the years and he is not entitled to any back wages. As stated earlier the workman does not dispute his employment in the Aska Sugar Factory. Therefore the question of passing any order for payment of back wages also does not arise. In short the workman is not entitled to any relief.

9. An Award is accordingly passed.

R. N. PANDA, Presiding Officer

Dated : 22-5-1987.

[No. I-12012/87/85-D, II(A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1987

का वा 1734—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकांश मद्रास की पंचाद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1987

S.O. 1734.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th June, 1987.

BEFORE THIRU FYZEE MAHMOOD, B.Sc., B.L., PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1987

Industrial Dispute No. 35 of 1985

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workman and the Management of State Bank of India, Regional Office, Madurai)

BETWEEN

Thiru M. Jeniston Deviraj,

C/o Resamal, Chareda, Thuckalay, P.O.,

Kanyakumari District-629175.

AND

The Chief Regional Manager,

State Bank of India, Regional Office,

Madurai.

REFERENCE :

Order No. I-12012/297/84-D II(A), dated 20-5-1985 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiruvalargal T.S. Gopalan, P. Ibrahim Kalifulla, S. Ravindran and N. C. Srinivasavaradhan, Advocates for the Management upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and other connected papers on record and the workman being absent, this Tribunal passed the following award.

AWARD

This dispute between the workman and the Management of State Bank of India, Regional Office, Madurai arises out of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in its Order No. I-12012/297/84-D, II(A), dated 20-5-1985 of the Ministry of Labour for adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri M. Jeniston Deviraj, Clerk in their Nagercoil Branch, w.c.f. 15th July, 1981 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

(2) Parties were served with summons.

(3) The Petitioner-workman filed claim statement on 1st August, 1985 putting forth his claim. In repudiation thereof, the Management filed their counter statement on 25th June, 1986.

(4) After several adjournments, when the dispute was taken up for enquiry today, Petitioner was absent and not represented. Management was represented by counsel.

(5) Hence Industrial Dispute is dismissed for default. There will be no order as to costs.

Dated, this 2nd day of June, 1987.

FYSFE MAHMOOD, Industrial Tribunal

[No. I-12012/297/84-D II(A)]

का वा. 1735—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकांश चंडीगढ़ के पंचाद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1735.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as



shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Punjab and Sind Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th June, 1987.

**BEFORE SHRI M. K. BANSAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,**

**CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 51/86.

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the management of Punjab and Sind Bank.

AND

Their workman: Manohar Lal.

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Employers. Shri V. K. Sharma.

For the workmen: Shri R. L. Chopra.

**INDUSTRY:** Banking **STATE:** Haryana

Dated 8-6-1987

**AWARD**

The dispute between the workman the Bank management was referred for arbitration by the Ministry of Labour vide notification No. L12012/53/85-DIV(A) dated 24th July 1986 which is as under:

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab and Sind Bank in terminating the services of Shri Manohar Lal, S/o Shri Chhagan Lal, Peon, Hissar Branch, with effect from 22-4-1984 is justified? If not to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. The workman in his claim statement alleged that from 28-1-1981 to 21-4-1984 he has worked with the Bank continuously. That he was appointed against a permanent vacancy of a peon. That the management terminated the services of the workman without giving any compensation. He alleged that his termination is void.

3. The management in their reply alleged that workman was appointed by the Hissar Branch of the Bank in leave vacancy due to increase in work that too for a short period. That workman never worked for about 240 days in any calendar year so his claim is not tenable. The detail of the period for which workman worked were specified in para 1 and 2 of the reply.

4. As onus was on the management to justify the termination, so the management was called upon to adduce evidence first. The management closed their evidence after tendering affidavit M1 of Shri T. S. Chawla, Chief Manager Punjab and Sind Bank posted at Gurgaon. Workman did not lead any evidence. He also relied on the affidavit M1 filed by the management.

5. The only point to be determined in the present reference is whether workmen worked for 240 days in any calendar year. Mr. T. S. Chawla MW1 has given detail for which the workman worked with the Bank as peon. He also admitted that the detail given in the written statement were wrongly specified. Persual of the detail given in para 1 shows that workman worked from 31-8-1981 to 24-7-1982 as under:

From	To	Total days
31-8-81	19-9-81	20 days
23-9-81	25-9-81	3 days
28-9-81	29-9-81	2 days
14-10-81	21-10-81	8 days
26-10-81	23-11-81	29 days
9-12-81	10-12-81	2 days
15-12-81	15-12-81	1 day
28-2-82	4-3-82	67 days
8-3-82	8-12-82	11 days
8-4-82	4-6-82	58 days
7-6-82	16-7-82	40 days
19-7-82	24-7-82	6 days

Total : 427 days

6. Persual of the above shows that workman worked for 247 days with the Bank he worked for more than 240 days in one calendar year, so he became regular employee and his services can not be terminated without any compensation. It is also admitted between the parties that no terminal compensation was paid to the workman. So order of termination dated 24-4-1984 is certainly not justified and is bad. The effect is that workman will be deemed to continue in service from 22-4-1984 onward with all back-wages and continuity in service.

7. As a result of my above findings workman is entitled to re-instatement in service wef. 22-4-1984 with continuity in service. He is also entitled to back wages from 22-4-1984 up-to-date. In a way reference is answered in favour of the workman.

Chandigarh.

M. K. BANSAL, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12012/53/85-DIV(A)]

सा. अ. 1736-- औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1917 का 11) की धारा 17 के अनुसारण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पञ्जाब देशवास बैंक के प्रबन्धन से सम्बन्धित नियोक्ताओं और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुषंग में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण न. 2 घनवाद के पक्षों को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 10-6-87 का प्राप्ति हुआ था।

S.O. 1736.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the

Punjab National Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th June, 1987.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD**

Reference No. 173 of 1986

In the matter of industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi and their workmen.

**APPEARANCES :**

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. K. Sabharwal, Authorised Representative.

**STATE :** Bihar                      **INDUSTRY :** Banking  
Dhanbad, the 10th June, 1987

**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-12012(85)/85-D.IV(A), dated the 28th April, 1986.

**SCHEDULE**

“Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank, Regional Office, Ranchi in terminating the services of Shri D. K. Liya, Mini Deposit Collector, Ranchi with effect from 31-1-1984 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

The case of the workmen is that the management of Punjab National Bank introduced a scheme known as Mini Deposit Scheme vide Deposit Mobilisation Circular dated 18-9-1976 with a view to bringing persons of low income group into the banking fold, by collecting their or their children's saving from their door step. For the implementation of the scheme, the Bank engaged Mini Deposit Collectors. Under the scheme a Mini deposit collector was to act as Publicity-cum-Collection representative of the Bank. A mini deposit collector engaged by the Bank in terms of the scheme was to be paid commission of 3 per cent of the deposits collected by him in a month. The Mini Deposit Collector in the terms of the scheme was required to enter into an agreement with the Bank and to act as Mini Deposit Collector. The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Shri D. K. Liya was appointed on 3-1-1978 at Punjab National Bank, Ranchi as Publicity-cum-Collection representative. Before his appointment the management had advertised in the local newspaper for the appointment to the post of Publicity-cum-Collection representative and in pursuance of the same the concerned workman had applied for his appointment. The concerned workman has been working as Publicity-cum-Collection representative since his

appointment on 3-1-1978 continuously with unblemished record of service and he was appointed as full time employee of the Bank. The management by its letter dated 3-1-1978 informed the concerned workman about the terms and conditions of his appointment and as per terms the concerned workman was to be appointed as publicity-cum-collection representative after entering into an agreement with the Bank for faithful discharge of duties and he was not to perform similar duty to any other financial institution or Bank. Accordingly the concerned workman had entered into an agreement with the management prior to his appointment. As per terms of the appointment and agreement, the concerned workman was working as Bank's employee under the direct control and supervision of the management. Average earning of the concerned workman was more than Rs. 1,000/- per month. He was discharging the same and similar duty which were being discharged by the employees of the Banks and in fact the job of the concerned workman was more onerous than the job of the Bank's employees. The concerned workman as faithful employee of the Bank vindicated before the higher authorities about the carelessness or behaviour of the then Manager and some other Bank employees towards Mini Deposit Collector and account holders. The higher authorities assured the concerned workman to look into the matter. The said representation of the concerned workman annoyed the then Bank Manager who was always in the look out to remove the concerned workman from his job. The then Bank Manager with an ulterior motive to punish the concerned workman terminated the services with effect from 31-1-1984 without affording any opportunity to him. The concerned workman represented before the management several times to allow him to resume his duties but with no effect. Seeing no other alternative the concerned workman raised an industrial dispute before the A.I.C.(C), Ranchi with the hope of amicable settlement but the conciliation proceeding ended in failure and thereafter the present reference has been made for adjudication. The action of the management in terminating his service of the concerned workman with effect from 31-1-1984 was illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the principles of natural justice. The action of the management in terminating the service of the concerned workman was vindictive and smacks of anti-labour policy of the management. The action of the management in denying pay scale at par with other employees of the Bank was illegal and the termination of the services of the concerned workman for demanding the same was an anti labour policy of the management. The concerned workman had rendered continuous service and had put in 240 days attendance in each calendar year prior to his termination of service. The services of the concerned workman was terminated without complying with the mandatory provision of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. On the above facts it has been proved that the concerned workman should be reinstated with full back wages with effect from 31-1-1984.

The case of the management is that there is no relationship of employer and employee between the concerned workman who was a Mini Deposit collector and the Bank. The concerned workman as Mini

Deposit Collector was a canvassing agent or person appointed to act as Commission Agent and he drew commission on the amount canvassed and procured by him. The relationship between the concerned workman and the Bank is that of Principal Agent and not that of an employer and employee. The concerned workman as Mini Deposit Collector was not an employee of the Bank. The concerned workman who was engaged by the Bank as Mini Deposit Collector for promoting Bank's business does not fall within the definition of 'workman' as contained in Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. The duties of Mini Deposit Collector are very limited and there are no further directions as to the control and manner in which the mini deposit collector has to perform his duties. The element of effective supervision for control which is necessary and ingredient of "Master-servant" relationship is altogether missing. The concerned workman was not also answerable to any disciplinary jurisdiction of the Bank. There was no specific hours of work to be put in by the Mini Deposit Collector. The extent and duration of the Agent of the concerned workman was entirely a matter with the subjective observation of the Agent himself. The concerned workman had no restriction nor here was any authority to supervise his work of the manner in which he was doing his work. There was no restriction upon the concerned workman regarding minimum and maximum hours of work to be put in by him. The Mini Deposit Collector himself was to fix the time of his visit to the customers depending upon his own convenience and convenience of the customers. Absence of fixed hours is itself an indication of the relationship between the Bank and the Mini Deposit collector. A person whose principal function is to promote the deposits is not a workman within the definition of the I.D. Act.

The service condition of the Bank employees are governed by Industrywise Award/Bipartite settlements. The employees have been classified in terms of para 23.15 of the Desai Award as (1) permanent employee, (2) Probationers, (3) Temporary employees and (4) Part-time employees. There is no other category in the workmen cadre having a status of workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. The service condition such as scales of pay and allowances, hours of work leave rules, medical aid expenses, disciplinary action rules and procedures etc. as laid down in the Awards/Bipartite settlements are applicable only to the above categories of workmen/employees and non else. With the inception of Banking service Recruitment Boards (hereinafter referred to as BSRB) all recruitments in public sector banks in clerical cadre are to be made through B.S.R.B. only. The Mini deposit scheme was actually implemented in the year 1977 and subsequently it was revised from time to time on the basis of experience gained. To implement the scheme Mini deposit collectors were engaged to visit the residence or the place of work of depositors as frequently as possible and atleast once in a month. Each day collection was to be deposited with the branch concerned by the Mini deposit collector on the next working day and the Mini deposit collector was to act as collection representative for which they were paid commission of 3 per cent on the deposits collected by them in a month. It is specifically provi-

ded under the scheme that Mini Deposit Collectors shall not be treated as member of the staff. The duties of the Mini Deposit Collectors was very limited and there was no further direction as to the control or manner in which a Mini Deposit Collector had to perform his duties. The deposit collectors are not the employees of the Bank but function as Commission Agent and draw the commission on the amount procured by them. The concerned workman was engaged as Mini Deposit Collector under the Mini deposit scheme by the Banks branch Manager, Ranchi on 3-1-1978 in terms of the scheme and he had entered into an agreement on 3-1-1978. Under the scheme the Agent was to commence from the date of execution of the agreement and was to continue to remain in force until terminated by the Bank at its discretion or by the Mini Deposit Collector giving three months of his intention of terminating the Agency. The allotment of agency of Mini Deposit Collector cannot be termed as employment in terms of the agreement executed by the concerned workman on taking up the Agency as Mini deposit Collector. The concerned workman was neither required to perform nor he performed any other duties except of Mini deposit collector under the scheme as laid down in the agreement executed by him. The contract with the concerned workman was a contract for service and not a contract of service as is the case with the regular employees of the Bank. The agreement voluntarily signed by the concerned workman as Mini deposit collector clearly states his relationship with the Bank and shows that he was only a commission agent and not an employee of the Bank. The concerned workman was neither an employee of the Bank nor workman under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. The agency of the concerned workman was only for one type of deposit, namely, under the mini deposit scheme and he had no authority to work for any other business of the Bank. The concerned workman who was performing the duties of Mini deposit collector cannot be held to be workman and there is no relationship of master and servant between him and the Bank and hence the concerned workman has no justification in getting his dispute adjudicated by this Tribunal. It is further submitted that as a Mini deposit collector are not workmen and as such the provision of the I.D. Act are not applicable to them.

The point for determination are whether (1) There is relationship of master and servant between the concerned workman and the management of the Bank i.e. to say whether the concerned workman is "Workman" under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, (2) the termination of services of the concerned workman by the management with effect from 31-1-84 was justified.

The management and the workmen each examined one witness in support of their respective cases. The documents of the management have been marked as Ext. M-1 to M-10 and the documents of the workmen are marked as Ext. W-1 to W-11.

An objection has been raised by the management that the reference is had under the I.D. Act since there is no relationship of employer and employee or a Master and servant between the concerned workman who was a Mini deposit collector of the Bank. The case of the management in short is th

the Mini deposit collectors are not the employee as of the Bank who function as Commission Agent for which commission is paid to them on the amount collected by them. The appointment of Mini deposit collector is made under the Mini deposit scheme. The said circular of Mini deposit scheme dated 18-9-76 is Ext. M-3 in this case. It appears from the said scheme that a Mini deposit account may be started with an initial deposit of Rs. 3 in cash and thereafter an amount in multiples of 50 p. could be collected by the Mini deposit collector. Under the scheme a Mini deposit collector was to visit the resident or the place of work of each depositor as frequently as possible but atleast once a month for collecting deposit and during his visit he was to most people for canvassing fresh deposit for the Bank. The Mini deposit collector was to deposit with the Branch concerned each days collection on the next day. The appointment of Mini deposit collector was to be made to act as Publicity-cum-collection representative of the Bank. He was to be appointed as far as possible from amongst the residents of the sector, and preference for appointment was to be given to retired teacher, banks retired employee, a student or ex-servicemen. The basis for selection was integrity, honesty, local influence and resourcefulness. He was required to read and write in English/local language and was to be able to maintain account of collection secured by him. It is clear, therefore, that the Mini deposit collector under the scheme was not to be appointed with qualification and requirement which are required for appointment of clerk in the Banks. In para 22 of the scheme it is provided that the collectors of mini deposits was not be treated as members of the staff and that the Mini deposit collector was required to enter into an agreement with the bank for due and faithful discharge of his duties and he had to give a declaration that he will not perform similar duties for any financial institution or a Bank. It will further show that a Mini deposit collector was to be paid a commission of 3 per cent on the deposit collected by him in a month, the amount of commission being debited to the Revenue head "Brokerage". Thus it is also made clear that the commission which the Mini deposit collector was to get was not his salary of an employee but it was just "Brokerage" for the collection of mini deposit made by him. The punishment to a mini deposit collector is provided in para 27 of the scheme for default in depositing daily collection and recovery of commission. In para 28 if a mini deposit collector is taken ill or proceeds on leave he should arrange to deposit the collection with the Bank through his authorised Agent and he was also to propose the name of his representative duly approved by the Bank to take up his duties during his absence or leave. This provision of leave and the arrangement is also peculiar to a regular employee of the bank. An employee in the Bank has no liberty to propose the name of his representative to take up his duties during his absence and admittedly the appointment in the Bank is made by B.S.R.B. Ext. M-7 is the agreement of the Agency entered into by the concerned workman with the management. It will appear from Ext. M-7 that by the said agreement dated 3-1-1978 between the concerned work-

man and the Punjab National Bank the concerned workman was appointed as Mini deposit collector in respect of scheme called Mini deposit scheme. The concerned workman agreed that his appointment shall be on the terms and conditions and will be bound by the rules and regulations framed by the Bank from time to time and such rules and regulations at present framed by the Bank in this regard set out in Annexure-A to the agreement. It was agreed that the Bank shall pay to the Mini deposit collector for functioning as Publicity-cum-Collection representative as may be determined by the Bank from time to time. The mini deposit collector shall not be entitled to or claim any other amount either by way of commission or remuneration allowance of any type or on any other account whatsoever. The Agency was to commence from the date of execution of the agreement and was to continue to remain in force until terminated by the Bank at its discretion. Ext. M-2 is the application of the concerned workman to the Manager, Punjab National Bank dated 26-9-77 by which he had applied for his appointment to the post of authorised collection agent under the Mini deposits scheme. The concerned workman in his evidence as WW-1 has stated that the Bank would not have given him to do any work other than the collection of the mini deposit as mentioned in the agreement. He has stated that the conditions of his work are stated in the agreement and no minimum contract was fixed for his collection per month. He has further stated that he used to decide himself as to whom to approach for collection of the deposit for which the time used to be fixed by him. He has stated that there was no person to control his work of collection outside the bank and that the Bank did not give office order directing him to perform any specific duties. Towards the end of his cross-examination he has stated that he is doing the work of a Mini deposit collector only and was doing no other work of the Bank. He further stated that he was Agent of the Bank and not its employee. Thus the evidence of the concerned workman also shows that he was an agent of the Bank and was not its employee. It was for this reason that he has stated in page 4 of his cross-examination that his demand is that he should be reinstated on the terms and conditions on which he had been engaged by the Bank. The mode of payment of the concerned workman was commission of 3 per cent of his collection on deposits made in the Bank. It is clear, therefore from the facts stated by the concerned workman himself that he was an Agent and not an employee of the Bank. The facts stated by him show that he was not a workman of the Bank. On perusal of Ext. M-2, M-7 read with the evidence of the concerned workman reveal that the agreement dated 3-1-1978 (Ext. M-7) signed by the concerned workman stipulated his status as Agent and that it was an agency agreement and not an agreement of employer and employee. It will further show that the concerned workman was governed by the terms and conditions of the agreement and the rules of the scheme and he was not governed by the service conditions of the Bank employees. MW-1 Shri G. R. Chadda has stated that the concerned workman was governed by the terms and conditions of the agreement and the rules of the scheme and the concerned workman himself as WW-1 has stated that the

conditions of his work are stated in the agreement. The application of the concerned workman Ext. M-2 will show that the concerned workman knew from the very inception that he was applying for the post of authorised collection Agent under the Mini deposit scheme. He has stated in his cross-examination that he was told that he would be getting commission on the amount of collection and that the Bank had not agreed to pay him anything more than the commission. It will also appear from his evidence that during the period of his work with the Bank the concerned workman had not demanded anything except his commission from the Bank for the work being performed by him. The evidence of the concerned workman which has been discussed earlier show that the contract of the concerned workman was not a contract of employment but was a contract for service as he was engaged for performing certain specified duties. It will also appear that the Bank was not having control on the concerned workman for directing him as to how the work has to be done by him and the same was left to the discretion of the concerned workman. Admittedly he was doing his work according to his own discretion and at his own convenience. The fact that the management had no supervision and control shows that the concerned workman was not an employee of the Bank and was simply an Agent engaged on commission to do the specified work of collecting mini deposits.

It will also appear that no attendance register was maintained to show the attendance of the concerned workman. Admittedly there was no working hours fixed for the work of the concerned workman. The only limitation under the scheme was that he was to deposit the amount of deposits on the next day of collection during the Banking hours. Admittedly, he was not getting CCA, HRA, DA etc. and he was not being paid any fixed monthly salary but he was paid commission on the basis of collection made by him. He was also not getting Bonus and P.F. Had he been a workman of the Bank he would have been entitled to all those facilities which the Banks employees are entitled. It will appear from the agreement itself that the concerned workman was not governed by service rules applicable to the Bank employees but was governed by the rules framed under the Mini deposit scheme.

In accordance with the terms of the agreement the concerned workman was prohibited from undertaking similar work with another bank or other financial institution. There was no restriction put upon the concerned workman in engaging himself in some other business or vocation for supplementing his income. The work of mini deposit collector under the scheme would easily be continued with some other work. This fact also distinguishes his status from a permanent employee of the Bank who in terms of their appointment by Award/bipartite settlement is prohibited from doing any other work or business outside the scope of his employment. It also shows that the concerned workman was not a whole time worker of the Bank and could also work at other place indicating that he was not "Workman" of the Bank as defined under section 2(S) of the I.D. Act.

In nut shell the terms and conditions on which

the concerned workman worked are incorporated in Ext. M-3 and M-7. The concerned workman was required to secure deposit from the customers and was to get commission on the amount collection by him. He was not required to attend to office in the bank building except for the purpose of depositing the amount of mini deposit collection, at any time during the Banking hours. He had no fixed hours to which he was required to work. There was also no condition that the concerned workman must collect a minimum amount of deposits per day or in a month. He could also do the work of mini deposit collection along with any other work if he was employed at any place. The concerned workman could get himself employed at any other place and the Bank was not concerned with it and it would not stand in the way of the agency of the concerned workman. The work of the concerned workman was not supervised by superior authority in the matter of securing deposits. He was not subjected to any service discipline as is applicable to the regular employees of the Bank. The name of the concerned workman did not appear on the roll of the company's employees as admittedly his attendance was not marked in the Bank. According to the terms of employment of the concerned workman he was to continue at the will of the Bank and it cannot be said that the concerned workman would continue to do as Mini deposit collector till superannuation as there is no question of superannuation in such employment. Considering the above facts and evidence it is clear that the employment of the concerned workman was a contract for service and not a contract of service and there was no relationship of employer and employee or master and servant between the concerned workman and the Bank as the evidence does not show that the concerned workman had been employed as workman by the Bank. It is clear that the concerned workman was not working as workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. He was employed as a Commission Agent for the purpose of collecting mini deposits. As the concerned workman is not a workman under the provision of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, the remedy for termination of the contract of the concerned workman with the management cannot be adjudicated by this Tribunal. I hold therefore that as Shri D. K. Liya is not "Workman" under Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act and as such he is not entitled to any remedy.

The services of the concerned workman was terminated under the terms of the agreement which shows that the concerned workman was an Agent of the Bank and not its employee and as such the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in terminating the services of the concerned workman with effect from 31-1-1984 cannot be interfered by this Tribunal and it is therefore to be held that the action of the management is justified.

Award is passed accordingly.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12012/85/85-D.IV(A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1987

का.प्र. 1737 — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुमरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, वैस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध तयोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुवन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अर्ध-करण, जबलपुर के पचाट का प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार का 15-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1987

S.O. 1/37.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employee in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JALBALPUR (M. P.)  
CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)(101)/1985.

#### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Eastern Coalfields Limited, Burhar No. 3, Mines of WCL, P.O. Dhanpuri, District, Shahdol (M.P.),

#### AND

Their workman Shri Allahuddin, General Mazdoor, represented through the Koyla Shramik Sangh, M.P. (CIU) Sohagpur Area Branch, P.O. Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.).

#### APPEARANCES:

For Union—Shri L. N. Malhotra, Advocate.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mining. DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.).

#### AWARD

Dated, May 5, 1987

This is a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-22012(13)/85-D.V. dated 8th November, 1985 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Whether the termination of Shri Allahuddin, General Mazdoor T. No. 742 of Burhar No. 3, Mines by the Colliery Manager, Burhar No. 3, Mine vide letter No. M/3/23/621 dated 13th April, 1983, while he was under treatment from 14th February, 1983 to 9th May, 1983 at Burhar Central Hospital and with Dr. S. N. Agrawal, RAMS, Shahdol, is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The case of the workman is that he was working as a General Mazdoor with the management since 1975. He was having clean, unblemished record and worked diligently. All of a sudden he fell sick and took treatment from the Colliery Hospital from 14-2-1983 to 5-4-1983 and was unable to do any work. As per practice the Hospital Authority and he himself intimated the management about his illness. (Photo stat copy of this record has been filed). Hospital Authorities declared him fit on 5-4-83 and the workman reported for duty on 6th April, 1983 but was refused work.

3. Further the workman not being satisfied with the treatment given took treatment from Dr. S. N. Agrawal from 22-3-1983 who continued his treatment till 9-5-1983. On 10-5-1983 he was declared fit and again went to join the duties but he was refused work on the ground that his services have already been terminated vide order dated 13-4-83 under Clause 17(ii) of the Standing Orders, which reads as under :—

"17(ii) Continuous absence without permission of 30 or more than 30 days by a workman will entail automatic termination of his service with the Company."

4. The management gave him no intimation or notice even though his address was with the management. He was also not informed that his application for leave has been rejected. Even the termination order was not communicated to him till 10-5-1983.

5. The case of the management is that he was absent from duty continuously from 14-2-1983. He was also a habitual absentee without permission or leave as his following attendance will show :—

1979	—	181 attendance.
1980	—	159 attendance.
1981	—	122 attendance.
1982	—	78-1/2 attendance.
1983	—	6 attendance.

In view of the provision of Clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company the services of the workman was terminated vide order dated 13-4-1983.

5A. During conciliation proceedings the workman relied on certain medical report. On verification of the record it was revealed that the workman concerned was examined on 14-2-1983 by Dr. O. P. Saxena, Senior Surgeon, but he was not declared medically unfit for performing duties. On the contrary, Dr. O. P. Saxena, advised blood test only, the workman, however, did not report for treatment till 22-2-83. Doctor who appeared before the A. L. C. stated that he did not declare him sick on record produced by the workman. The workman had also submitted a certificate from a private Dr. S. N. Agrawal under whom he was in treatment as O. P. D. patient from 23-2-1983 to 9-5-1983 and was declared fit to resume duty from 10-5-1983. But as already pointed out the workman as alleged was under treatment of M.O. and Senior Medical Officer, Burhar Central Hospital. Therefore, the medical certificate of Dr. Agrawal submitted appears to be an after thought. In case this Tribunal holds that an enquiry should have been held that the management prays that they be given an opportunity to prove unauthorised absent before this Tribunal.

6. Further it is alleged by the management that the workman got the record manipulated which shows his dishonesty. Therefore he is unfit for employment and thus the management has lost confidence on the workman. The reference is bad in law.

7. As for the justification of termination is concerned it depends on the proof of the fact whether the workman was under treatment from 14-2-1983 to 9-5-1983 at Burhar Central Hospital and with Dr. S. N. Agrawal. In the instant case, management held no domestic enquiry before terminating the workman. It was thus a case of termination without domestic enquiry. Therefore this Tribunal allowed the management to prove misconduct and the workman to rebut the same. In this regard management has examined Dr. O. P. Saxena who gave evidence regarding certain documents relied on by the workman. It appears that in conciliation proceedings the workman had relied on documents Ex. W/1 to Ex. W/5. Dr. O. P. Saxena has given the statement regarding these documents. His version is that he is the Medical Superintendent Incharge of Burhar Central Hospital from 1977. On the basis of original out-door Patients Register and Sick Register of the relevant period he has stated that in O. P. D. Register entry for 14-2-1983 start from no. 5835 and not from 1435 (which has been mentioned in sick certificate Ex. W/1A). This Ex. W/1A is said to be a sick and Fit Certificate issued by Burhar Central Hospital for the period from 14-2-83 to 26-3-83. This also does not bear either his signature or of any other Doctor of the Hospital and it is also not under the hand writing of the dealing clerk Mr. Budhsen Vishwakarma. He has further mentioned that there is no entry relating to the workman being allowed sick in the O. P. D. and Sick Register for 14-2-1983.

8 Ex. W/2 and Ex. W/3 are the Medical record of the workman. Regarding this document, the Doctor has stated that the word "sick" shown on page no. 11 is neither in

his hand writing nor in the hand writing of any other Doctor of the hospital. On 14-2-1983 workman Allahuddin had come to him and he had advised blood test only. He was not declared sick or unfit either on that day or on any other date in February and March. Therefore also the question of giving him certificate Ex. W/1A (photo copy Ex. W/1) does not arise. In his cross-examination he has stated that when he had examined the workman on 14-2-83 no other Doctor wrote word "sick" below his signature. The word "fit" in portion marked C to C relates to sickness dated 1-4-83 in portion marked B to B of Ex. W/3. Thus nothing material is brought out in his cross-examination to discredit his testimony. On the other hand, workman gave his own statement and relied on the above documents. His version in the examination-in-chief is that on 14-2-1983 he fell ill and he appeared before Dr. Dass. He treated him and wrote word "sick" on Ex. W/2. He was treated in Burhar Hospital till 5-4-83 and on 6-4-83, Dr. Giri declared him fit in Ex. W/3. He went to join the duty on 6-4-83 but he was refused the same. He therefore gave his joining report Ex. W/4. He has further stated that he was not getting relief in the Colliery Hospital therefore he had taken the treatment of Dr. Agarwal who gave him the certificate Ex. W/5. Now in his cross-examination this witness has admitted that on 14-2-1983 Dr. Saxena has examined him and advised him blood test but he asserts that Dr. Dass had written sick. It cannot said to be probable that once a person is examined by one Doctor the other will write the word "sick" just below his signature and not sign himself. As for sick and fit certificate Ex. W/1A witness has stated that his father had found lying somewhere so he had filed the same in the colliery.

9. From the perusal of all the documents i.e. Ex. W/1 to Ex. W/6, I find that they appear to be self contradictory. Ex. W/2 and Ex. W/3 go to show that as if the workman was under treatment in a colliery hospital from 14-2-1983 (declared sick till 5-4-83 and declared fit on 6-4-1983). But at the same time Dr. Agarwal's certificate Ex. W/5 goes to show that he was under his treatment from 22-3-1983 to 9-5-1983. Now a person cannot be expected to take treatment at the same time two places. Besides the alleged application of the workman Ex. W/4 goes to show that he was declared fit on 21-3-1983. If it is so, it is surprising how he continued to take treatment from Dr. Agarwal from 22-3-1983 onwards and did not join his duties. On the other hand Ex. W/3 shows that he was declared fit on 6-4-83 which is in contradiction to Ex. W/4.

19. The case against the workman is that he remained absent from 14-2-1983 to 9-5-1983 without leave or prior permission. The workman had adduced certain evidence in the conciliation proceedings and the same has been relied on before me also. I have disbelieved his evidence. But the fact remains that as the management has also admitted that he appeared for treatment on 14-2-1983 and he was advised blood test. Thereafter he only appeared on 22-2-1983. Record also shows that he was under treatment from 1-4-1983 to 5-4-1983 also. Therefore though his absence was without permission and leave but there was certainly some justification for his absence for a few days on account of illness. In the circumstances, natural justice required that atleast he should have been given a show cause notice on his home address to show cause before the provision of Clause 17(ii) of the Standing Orders were utilised. Even if I leave above contention apart, even then the termination is void ab initio. Admittedly they neither gave any notice nor one month's pay in lieu notice or retrenchment compensation as laid down under Sec. 25F of the I. D. Act. In the case of *L. Robert D' Souza Vs Executive Engineer, Southern Railway (1982-ILIJ 330)* and *Delhi Cloth and General Mills Ltd. Vs. Shambhunath Mukerjee (AIR 1978 SC P. 8)* it has been held.—

"Striking off the name of the workman from the rolls by the management is termination of his service. Such termination of service is retrenchment within the meaning of S. 2(a) of the Act. The provisions of S. 25F(a), the proviso put, and (b) are mandatory and any order of retrenchment, in violation of these two peremptory conditions precedent, is invalid."

Therefore also, the termination amounts to retrenchment and for having not complied with S. 25F of the I. D. Act retrenchment is void ab initio.

11. In a similar case when a person overstayed his leave Hon'ble Supreme Court held that such a discharge of service of an incumbent by way punishment amounts to removal of service though the service regulation provides for such an action as has been commented by learned Author Suranjan Chakravorty in his book 'Law on Wrongful Dismissal' 6th Ed. at page 436 and 437.

12. In any case assuming that his discharge is proper the punishment to my mind is too severe which acts as a punishment not only himself but to his family members. The management had objected to the reinstatement of the workman also on the ground that since he has filed wrong fitness certificate and manipulated his record, therefore they lost confidence in him. In this connection, it will be suffice to say that the workman is a general mazdoor and not a clerk who is to do any writing work in the office. There is no allegation or proof regarding his work as a general mazdoor about loss of confidence. Therefore the plea is worthless.

13. For the reasons discussed above, I am of the opinion that the plea of the workman that he was under treatment in the Burhar Central Hospital and Dr. Agrawal continuously from 14-2-1983 till 9-5-83 is not true. In any case, Dr. S. N. Agrawal has not been examined to prove the correctness of the certificate.

14. How the only question remains whether the punishment awarded is proper and legal. The charge against the workman was that he was absent from duty continuously from 14-2-83. The controversy is only about the remaining period and sick and fitness certificate. He had appeared in Burhar Hospital on 14-2-1983 because he felt that he was not well. This shows that his absence though not fully justified, yet for certain period he was ailing. In the circumstances, punishment of termination appears to be rather harsh and improper. He could have been taken in service and awarded some punishment instead of termination of services.

15. Next question arise from what date he is now entitled to be reinstated what wages be allowed him. I am of the opinion that since the misconduct has been proved and it has been upheld by this Tribunal also and also on technical ground the termination is held to be void ab initio the workman is only entitled to be reinstated continuity of service for the purpose of seniority but without back wages till the date of publication of this award. Consequently I answer the reference as under :—

That the termination of Shri Allahuddin, General mazdoor T. No. 743 of Burhar No. 3 since by the Colliery Manager, Burhar No. 3 Mine. Vide letter No. M/3/23/631 dated 13-4-83 is justified because he was not under treatment for the entire period from 14-8-1983 to 9-5-1983 at Burhar Central Hospital and with Dr. S. N. Agarwal, BNS, Shahdol. The punishment awarded to him is excessive. Therefore as a relief he is entitled to be reinstated from the date of publication of this award but without any back wages with continuity of service all other ancillary reliefs. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer  
[No. I. 22012/13/85-D. V(D. III(B))]

का.प्र. 1738.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का

14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, खरसिया खार्डजईट साईट आफ़ थिलाई स्टील प्लांट, थिलाई के प्रबन्धक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जखनपुर में पंचाईत को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

SO 1738.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kharsia Quartzite Mine of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.



BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)  
Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(50)/1984

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of Kharasia Quartzite Mine of Bhilai Steel Plant, P.O. Bhilai, District Durg (M.P.) and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Sanyukta, Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, LIG-9, Vaisali Nagar, Bhilai, Distt. Durg (M.P.)

**APPEARANCES :**

For Union—Shri C. R. Bakshi.

For Management—Shri D. C. Henri, Senior Law Officer

**INDUSTRY :** Quartzite Mining **DISTRICT :** Durg (M.P.)

**AWARD**

Dated, the 2nd June, 1987

This is a reference made by the Central Government vide Notification No. L-29011(94)/83-D.11 (B) dated 16th July, 1984 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai in closing down their Kharasia Quartzite Mine with effect from 1-10-1982 and terminating the services of the workmen employed therein is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

2. The case of the Union is that the management of Bhilai Steel Plant had opened Quartzite Mine at Kharasia Raipur of M.P. from February 1980 for the purpose of Mining Quartzite. The work was started with nearly 40 raising mazdoors recruited through the Employment Exchange. Some of their staff including the statutory staff were brought on transfer from captive mines of the Bhilai Steel Plant, 18 of the mazdoors of Katni Fire Clay Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant on closure were offered alternative employment in Kharasia Quartzite Mines. Thus the total strength of the workmen in Kharasia Mines rose to nearly 60 mazdoors.

3. Upto 30th September, 1982 the Mining Operation was conducted without break and its product was despatched to Bhilai Steel Plant. However, on 30-9-1982 the Mines Manager, Kharasia put up a closure notice and asked the leaving mazdoors to collect their dues and leave mines. However, they transferred their time rated workers from Kharasia Mines to Hirri Dolomite Mines.

4. The raising mazdoors were employed in Kharasia for more than 240 days in a year for 2-3 years continuously.

In fact, the intention of the management was not to close down the mine but to transfer it to Refractory Plant, Bhilai, without letting the raising mazdoors to know this in order to take away right of their alternative employment. The ownership of the mine was not transferred. Only the Agent of the Mine was changed from Shri M. B. Bhaduri to Shri Ashok Mukerji one of the Chief Executive of the Bhilai Refractory Plant. From this it is evident that the Kharasia Mine was under the process of transfer for which the closure was forced upon the workers. This mine was actually being operated to supply quartzite to Bhilai Refractory Plant on regular basis which was despatched to Bhilai and about 500 tonnes quartzite steel is lying in the pit head.

6. This closure was done without any notice under Sec. 2-FF and the closure notice which was affixed was not in compliance with the provisions of Sec. 2-FFA of the I. D. Act. The management practised discrimination and did not provide alternative employment to these 50 raising mazdoors including ones given alternative employment from Katni Fire Clay Mines.

7. Bharat Refractory Limited is an independent Public Sector Company and its Bhilai Refractory Plant Unit that has been in operation for production of special bricks for which quartzite is a perennial requirement as raw material and it can take lease for that purpose. The management of

Bhilai Steel Plant had started the mining operation at Kharasia on their own to meet their requirement. In fact, the workers had been shown in their record as raising mazdoors and they were appointed on casual basis as unskilled mazdoors at daily rate under Minimum Wages Act which may be changed to piece rate afterwards from the date of their joining. They were not employed either intermittently or for specific period.

8. The case of the management is that Bhilai Steel Plant (hereinafter referred to as the management) is a unit of Steel Authority of India Ltd. and is a Public Sector Undertaking. A request was made by Bhilai Refractory Plant of Bharat Refractory Ltd. another Public Sector Undertaking which was earlier unit of Steel Authority of India Ltd. but subsequently bifurcated and made an independent Company for supply of quartzite for experiments to test suitability or otherwise. Accordingly, a mining lease was obtained by the Management of Bhilai Steel Plant from the Government of M.P. in the district of Raigarh at Kharasia for exploratory mining of quartzite. The lease was granted from October, 1979.

9. For conducting exploratory mining operation for getting details for preparation of prospecting report some workers were employed for specific period from February 1981 to September 1982 on casual basis and daily rate with a clear stipulation that their services would stand discontinued on completion of work. Their last employment was from 1-7-1982 to 30-9-1982. Since the exploratory work was over and report was given to Bharat Refractory Ltd. there was no use for Kharasia quartzite Mines and it was accordingly closed. Thus all the workmen who had completed 240 days were offered retrenchment compensation but they refused and demanded re-employment.

10. Mining Lease of Kharasia was not obtained for supply of any minerals to Bhilai Steel Plant but was obtained only for exploratory work and to prepare a report for use of Bharat Refractory Ltd. and it was closed down on completion of work. The position that their job was for specific period and neither regular nor permanent was known to the workmen and it was accepted by their Union, Sanyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, which is the party to the dispute.

11. The management is willing to pay the retrenchment compensation or is willing to deposit it in Court. Number of workmen employed were only 51 and the mining lease was taken only for exploratory work and the minerals obtained was not meant for use of Bhilai Steel Plant. The time rated workmen were brought on loan basis from other mines. Therefore on completion of work they were transferred back.

12. On analysis the mineral was not found suitable hence the work was stopped. However, subsequently mining lease was obtained for the same area by Bharat Refractory Ltd. and not by Bhilai Refractory Plant. The tenure of appointment was known to the workers hence no notice was required. There cannot be a comparison between a regular worker and casual worker. In fact, the management has the problem of solving surplus man power and it does not mean that because it is a public Sector they can continue to employ persons who are not required.

13. The question that arise for consideration are what was the nature of the mining operation and employment of these workmen. Further more as provision of the I. D. Act if any will apply to the facts of the present case and consequential relief, if any.

14. In order to prove their respective claims parties have examined one witness each and relied on certain documents. On behalf of the workmen Shri Narayan Pal, the former Recorded of Kharasia Mine (WW-1) have been examined and documents Ex. W-1 to Ex. W-5 have been relied on. Shri Narayan Pal has stated that he was appointed as Recorder in Kharasia Mine on 14th May, 1980. In 1981 he became Branch Secretary of the Union, S.K.M. Sangh, Kharasia. He was paid wages fortnightly at daily rate on muster roll Kharasia Quartzite Mine was declared a mine on 8-2-1980 where 52 workmen were working. Another 8 persons were permanent workers of Bhilai Steel Plant. The mine was closed by Bhilai Steel Plant on 30th September,



1982. Thereafter, their regular workers were transferred to other mine and services of temporary workmen were terminated. He has further stated that no notice of closure of mine was affixed or given to them. They were neither paid retrenchment compensation nor notice for compensation was given to him. At the time of appointment they were not told that the mine is temporary or seasonal only. On the other hand, they were assured that if their work will be satisfactory they will be made permanent. Mines Manager had also told him that this mine will be transferred to Bharat Refractory Plant of whose full supply was given by the Kharasia Quartzite Mine.

15. In this connection, minutes of discussion dated 9-4-1981 between the management of Khilwadkhurd Fire Clay Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant and the Union is relied on. Para 5 of the discussion says that the management shall arrange to provide fresh employment who opt for the same in Kharasia Quartzite Mine with effect from 1-5-1981. But this does not disclose the nature of the operation of the Mine or the nature of employment given to these workmen. On the other hand, management has examined Shri R. P. Saha, Supdt. of Geology and Mines and Quarries Department of Bhilai Steel Plant. He has stated that the mining lease of Kharasia Quartzite Mine was obtained. Bhilai Refractory Plant is working under Bharat Refractory Ltd. Bokaro. In the year 1978 Bhilai Steel Plant had requested to undertake prospective work in Kharasia since they did not have the prospective work with them. Therefore the Bhilai Steel Plant applied for and started prospecting work in the mine i.e. exploring to find out reserve minerals. Bhilai Steel Plant is taking up prospecting work throughout India for minerals. For this purpose they gave only few departmental workers and employed workers locally. Their job was of temporary nature and as soon as the prospecting work was over their services were discontinued. Same thing happened in the instant case and we submitted our report after completion of work. The Mining Lease was also transferred to Bharat Refractory Plant who was asked to take these labourers but they were not ready because they wanted to undertake work through contractors. His statement is supported by documentary evidence as well. Ex. M-2 is the minutes of discussion dated 2-2-1982 between the Union and the Bhilai Steel Plant. In this regard in item No. 1 management had clearly stated that Bhilai Steel Plant is only doing exploratory work and for the regular mining work it is being handed over to Bharat Refractory Ltd. Management also promised to make efforts for the absorption of these employees by Bharat Refractory Ltd. Ex. M-3 goes to show that the management of Bhilai Steel Plant did make offer but Bharat Refractory Ltd. refused to take them on rolls. Ex. M-4 is the sanction order dated 10-7-1982 which says that the management is pleased to accord sanction for the engagement of 52 unskilled casual labourers with effect from 1st May, 1982 to 30th September, 1982 for exploration of quartzite at Kharasia Mine. Their services will be terminated (1) Automatically on completion of their present term of employment (2) of the discretion of employing officer on closure or postponement of Mines/ Works (3) If their services are not found satisfactory. The above letter clear goes to show that the mining operation was for exploration only and that too for a specified period and the employment was to be of casual nature for specified period. This is also what is spelled out from office orders Ex. M-6 to Ex. M-8. The fact that this nature of the mining operation and the nature of their employment was not made known to these workmen specially to those who were re-employed and their appointment order Ex. W-1 mentioned them as raising mazdoor (not as casual) will not to my mind change the nature of operation or their employment. Failure of the management to let the workers know the nature of their mining operation and nature of their employment from before has hardly any bearing on the point in issue. On the other hand, on behalf of union it has been contended relying on case of Mukunda Vs. Managing Director, K.S.R.T.C. (reported in 1986-I-LJ 470), that the fact that services of workmen were of broken period it will not end the relationship of employer and employee in interpreting the word "actual worked" as appeared in Section 25-B(2) of the I. D. Act. These workmen had worked for more than 240 days in the last preceding year. Therefore they are entitled to be made permanent and they could not have been retrenched by the management. As far as the principle of law are concerned there can be no dispute on the matter. But the facts here are different. As I have already notified that

the nature of operation was exploratory and not of mining and nature of work was not perennial and was only for specified period. Therefore the employment of these workmen at the end of the specified period would come to an end.

16. Learned representative of the Union, Shri Bakshi, argued that this case falls under Sec. 25(o) of Chapter VB which lays down the procedure of closing down an undertaking. It is mandatory for the management when closing down its undertaking of an industrial establishment to seek prior permission at least 90 days before the date of closure. Admittedly, no such permission has been sought in the instant case, but looking to the provision of Sec. 25-K, Sec. 25(o) will not apply to the present case. Section 25-K clearly says that it will not apply in cases where not less than 100 workmen were employed or which are of seasonal character or worked intermittently. Admittedly, none of these conditions are fulfilled in the instant case. In the alternative, learned representative of the Union, Shri Bakshi, contended that it amounts to transfer of undertaking within the meaning of Sec. 25-FF of the I. D. Act. On the other hand, case of the management is that it was a case of closure within the meaning of Sec. 25-FFA of the I. D. Act. I am of the opinion that in the instant case I need not dwell on this issue and try to find out whether it amounts to closure or transfer because the result is the same i.e. both provided for compensation as laid down under Sec. 25-F of the I. D. Act as has also been laid down in the case of S.G. Chemical and Toys Trading Ltd. and another, 1986-I-LJ SC 490).

17. On behalf of the Union, it has been further contended that the management just affixed a notice dated 30-9-1982 a day before the closure as is apparent from Ex. W-3. It has been further contended that no notice and compensation was given to the workmen before the closure as laid down under Sec. 25-FFA and Sec. 25-FFP of the I. D. Act and the management has also failed to give 60 days notice before the intended closure to the appropriate Government. His notice was necessary to enable the Government to take appropriate steps as laid down in the case of S.G. Chemicals Ltd. (supra). From the evidence on record, I have no hesitation to say that the management did commit the breach of the above provision. But they were willing to pay the retrenchment compensation and the Union on behalf of the workmen made a settlement in this regard vide Ex. M-1 dated 9-4-1981 in the following words :—

"(6) Agreed that all legal dues including 30 days notice pay calculated on the basis of 30 days average notice pay earned by the workers immediately before the date of closure, will be paid to all the retrenched workers as per Rules."

In any case, payment of compensation under Sec. 25-FFP is not a condition precedent to closure (See page 1387 of the Law of Industrial Dispute by O. P. Malhotra). Similarly at page 1360 the learned Author has commented —

"But the question arises whether the failure of the employer to comply with the requirements make the closure illegal or nonest. The answer appears to be in the negative because from the language in the section no provision of closure is discerned. If law prohibits closure, the closure does not become illegal. This is so because there is a penal provision provided for non-compliance."

18. For the reasons discussed above I hold that the working of the mine was only exploratory for specified period and therefore the employment of these workmen was also for a specified period. Therefore after the exploration was completed closure of the mine and retrenchment of these workmen was justified. However they were entitled to the compensation as laid down under Sec. 25-F of the I. D. Act. Consequently I answer the reference as under :—

That the management of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai in closing down their Kharasia Quartzite Mine with effect from 1-10-1982 and terminating the services of the workmen employed therein is justified, but their failure to pay them compensation as required under Sec. 25-F of the I. D. Act was not justified. Therefore it is directed that the management of Bhilai Steel Plant should pay the workers compensation as required under Sec. 25-F of the I. D. Act, 1947 within three

months from the date of this award failing which it will carry interest @ 12% per annum. Since the compensation has not been paid each workman shall be paid Rs. 500 as costs of the litigation by the management of Bhilai Steel Plant.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-29011/94/83-D.III (B)]  
V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1987

क्र. प्र. 1739.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का. 14) की धारा 18 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लि. की बोकारो कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन से सम्बन्धित नियोजन और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध से निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं. 2, धनबाद के पचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8-6-87 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 23rd Jue, 1987

S.O. 1739.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bokaro Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th June, 1987.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2), AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 110 of 1985

In the matter of industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bokaro Colliery of C.C. Ltd. and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers : Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 28th May, 1987

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(6)/85-D.IV(B), dated, the 14th July, 1985.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bokaro Colliery of C. C. Ltd., P.O. Bermo, Distt. Giridih in punishing Shri Sheopujan Singh and not paying him the wages in excess of subsistence allowance, demoting him to the post of Truck Khalasi from the

post of Driver and transferring him is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Shri Sheopujan Singh was a Truck Driver of Bokaro Colliery of CCL. He was on duty from 9 P.M. on 5-1-84 to 5 A.M. on 6-1-84. Towards the end of his duty the tyre of the back wheel of his truck No. BRY 3048 got punctured and he took the wheel to Shri Nakhru for its repair. Thereafter he went to his quarter being off from the duty. At about 12 Noon. He again went to Shri Nakhru to obtain the tyre and handed over the tyre to Shri Niamat Ali, truck driver, who was working in his succeeding shift. After handing over the tyre to Niamat Ali the concerned workman went to the nearby betel shop. When he was taking betel at the betel shop he received serious jerk in his leg and was injured in the leg with a jeep being driven by Shri B. Akla, Dy. Chief Mining Engineer of Bokaro Colliery. The jeep being driven by Shri Akla had dashed against the concerned workman causing him hurt in the leg. The concerned workman took off his blood stained shoe and showed the injury to Shri Akla stating that had there been any other person he would not have allowed him to move from there. Shri Akla got enraged and started the jeep and went away with his wife saying that he would teach lesson to the concerned workman for his audacity to utter such words in the public. All these had happened at the check post. The concerned workman received order on the same day at 4 P.M. from the General Manager B & K suspending him with immediate effect, pending formal issue of chargesheet and he was transferred from Bokaro Excavation to the G.M.'s Office at Kargali. By the letter dt. 11-1-84 the General Manager served the chargesheet on the concerned workman. The concerned workman replied to the chargesheet on 12-1-84 denying the charges. The management ordered for a domestic enquiry against the concerned workman into the charges levelled against him in which the concerned workman participated. Some witnesses named by the concerned workman were not allowed to be produced before the enquiry as defence witness. The enquiry was only a show. As the enquiry officer was a friend of Shri B. Akla, the finding of the enquiry officer were against the evidence produced during the enquiry and as such the enquiry was perverse. By the letter dt. 12-6-84 the concerned workman was punished by the General Manager (B&K) Kargali demoting him as Truck Khalasi in Cat. II. He was ordered to be paid subsistence allowance @ 50 per cent of his wages for the first 30 days of his suspension and @ 75 per cent thereafter and his remaining wages were forfeited. The concerned workman was also transferred to Giridih Colliery. The concerned workman carried out the above order and joined Giridih Colliery leaving his family uncared at Bokaro. The concerned workman was thus victimised for no fault of his own and he was given three punishments for his alleged audacity to take to the Dy. C.M.E. The annual increment of the concerned workman which fell due in March, 1984 and March, 1985 have also been withheld without any reason. It has been prayed that an Award be passed holding that the action of the management in punishing Sheopujan Singh on 3 counts for the alleged misconduct was bad in law, illegal and unjustified and the concerned workman be restored to his post of truck driver which he was held holding prior to 6-1-84 and be paid the difference of wages between those of truck khalasi and truck driver. It has also been prayed that the concerned workman be allowed the annual increment which fell due in March, 1984 and March, 1985.

The case of the management is that the reference is bad in law and not maintainable. The sponsoring union, the Coalfields Labour Union, does not exist or operate either in Bokaro Colliery or Giridih Colliery of CCL and is not competent to raise the present dispute. The concerned workman is not a member of the sponsoring union and as such the sponsoring union is not competent to raise the present dispute. Bokaro Colliery and Giridih Colliery are two of the collieries among other falling within Bokaro and Kargali Area of CCL. The Bokaro Colliery was headed at all relevant times by a Dy. Chief Mining Engineer who was also the Project Officer and Agent of the colliery. The Dy. Chief Mining Engineer of Bokaro Colliery has occasionally to visit the Bokaro Colliery Hospital which has

number of beds for indoor patient in course of his normal inspection as the head of the colliery. On such occasions his wife also accompanies him as she does social work and looks after the female patients in the hospital and enquires about their welfare, medical aid which is being given to them and any assistance required by them. Shri B. Akla, Dy. Chief Mining Engineer, Bokaro colliery reported to the G.M. B and K area that on 6-1-84 at about 1.15 P.M. when he was passing No. 4 Area check post of Bokaro Colliery in his jeep BRY 3358 he had to stop there due to jamming of traffic. At that time all of a sudden the concerned workman Shri Sheo Pujan Singh Driver rushed to the jeep of Shri Akla and opened the right side door forcibly and the concerned workman started using filthy language to the officers of Bokaro Colliery on some alleged grievances. When Shri Akla explained to the concerned workman that it was not the proper place and time to put up the alleged grievance the concerned workman became furious and took out his shoe with an intention to assault Shri Akla but due to timely intervention the security personnels and others at the check post the assault on Shri Akla was averted. In the past also the concerned workman had indulged in acts of misbehaviour and was in the habit of misbehaving with the superior officers. On receipt of the above report from Shri Akla, the G.M., B and K area suspended the concerned workman on 6-1-84 pending issue of a chargesheet. The concerned workman was also immediately transferred to the office of the G.M. (B and K) Area. Subsequently on 11-1-84 the concerned workman was issued with a chargesheet. The concerned workman submitted an explanation dated 12-1-84 to the chargesheet. Finding the explanation of the concerned workman unsatisfactory, the General Manager B and K Area who was the disciplinary authority appointed Shri I. Chandra, Dy. Chief Mining Engineer/Project Officer as the Enquiry Officer to hold an enquiry into the charges levelled against the concerned workman. Shri B. D. Shaw, Suptd. of Mine Bokaro Colliery was appointed as the management's representative to conduct the case on behalf of the management before the enquiry officer. The appointment of the enquiry officer was done with due intimation to the concerned workman. The concerned workman was allowed to take the assistance of Shri Ganpat Lal, Fitter to defend him in the enquiry proceeding. Shri Ganpat Lal attended some of the sittings of the enquiry and subsequently he did not attend the enquiry due to some personal reasons. Thereafter the concerned workman wanted the enquiry to proceed without any co-worker when Shri Ranjit Singh another co-worker of Bokaro Colliery refused to work as Co-worker. The witnesses of the management were examined in the presence of the concerned workman and he was given full opportunity to cross-examine them. He was also given opportunity to make his statement and he also produced two witnesses in his defence. The concerned workman wanted to produce some more witnesses as his defence witness which was not allowed by the enquiry officer. The enquiry held by the management was in accordance with the principles of natural justice and all possible and reasonable opportunities were given to the concerned workman to defend himself. After completing the enquiry the enquiry officer submitted his report to the General Manager, B and K Area who was the disciplinary authority. On consideration of the report of the enquiry officer and the relevant papers the General Manager agreed with the finding of the enquiry officer and considering the gravity of the misconduct proved against the concerned workman he felt that this was a fit case for dismissal of the concerned workman but the G.M. only passed the order demoting the concerned workman to the post of Truck Khalasi in Cat. II and transferred the concerned workman to Giridih Colliery. The misconduct proved against the concerned workman attracted clause (f) (v) of Standing Orders 17(1) of the relevant Standing Orders. Accordingly the concerned workman was demoted to the post of Truck Khalasi from the post of Truck Driver in Cat. II and was transferred to Giridih Colliery by an order issued by the management dated 12-6-84. Under the Standing Orders applicable to the concerned workman he was liable to be transferred from one colliery establishment of the management to another colliery/establishment. Both Bokaro and Giridih Colliery formerly belonged to the erstwhile N.C.D.C. Ltd., which has since been re-named as CCL with effect from 1-11-75 and the certified standing orders as applicable to the coal mines of NCDCL are applicable to both these collieries. As per the certified Standing Orders a workman who has been placed under suspension pending enquiry into the charges can claim full wage only if he is

exonerated otherwise he is only entitled to the subsistence allowance. The action taken by the management in demoting the concerned workman to the post of Truck Khalasi and not paying him wages in excess of subsistence allowance besides transferring him to Giridih Colliery is legal and justified. It was further submitted that the fairness and validity of the domestic enquiry may first be decided as a preliminary issue by the Tribunal so that in case the domestic enquiry is held to be vitiated the management can produce the evidence on merit afresh before the Tribunal.

As the workmen challenged the fairness and validity of the domestic enquiry held against the concerned workman and the management also desired that the same be decided as a preliminary issue, the Tribunal took up the said matter as a preliminary issue. The management examined the enquiry officer and the concerned workman also examined himself in connection with the preliminary issue whether the domestic enquiry was fair proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. By the order dated 18-2-86 the Tribunal held that the enquiry held against the concerned workman was not fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and as such the said enquiry was vitiated. The management was given opportunity to adduce the evidence afresh before this Tribunal to establish the charges against the concerned workman.

The points for decision are (1) whether the punishment of demoting the concerned workman to the post of Truck Khalasi from the post of Driver was justified, (2) whether non-payment of wages in excess of subsistence allowance to the concerned workman during the pendency of the enquiry proceeding was justified and (3) whether the transfer of the concerned workman to Giridih Colliery was justified.

The management examined four witnesses to prove the charges against the concerned workman. The workmen examined five witnesses in defence of the concerned workman the management's documents had already been marked as Ext. M-1 to M-20 at the time of the hearing of the preliminary issue.

Ext. M-1 is the chargesheet dt. 11-1-84 and Ext. M-2 dt. 13-1-84 is the reply of the concerned workman to the chargesheet. Ext. M-2 was the first statement which the concerned workman had given in respect of occurrence for which he has been charged. It will appear from Ext. M-2 that the concerned workman was taking betel from a betel shop situated in No. 4 area and was facing west and in the meantime a Jeep dashed him from behind thereby he was pushed towards the betel shop. It is further stated that the concerned workman got injury in his leg. The concerned workman got up and caught the gate of the jeep to see as to who was driving the said jeep. When he opened the gate of the jeep he saw Sh. Akla, and as such he did not abuse him or misbehave with him. He also stated that if he had used any abusive language before he saw Shri Akla in the Jeep, he may be excused as he was not in his sense as he had got injury in his leg. He further stated that even if he committed any mistake he may be excused and that he would not repeat such mistake in future. Thus it is admitted that on 6-1-84 at about 1-15 P.M. when Shri B. Akla, Dy. C.M.E. of Bokaro Colliery was passing, No. 4 area check post there was some incident with the concerned workman at the said check post. It is also admitted that the concerned workman had opened the gate of the jeep which was being driven by Shri Akla. Although in clear words the concerned workman has not accepted to have abused or misbehaved with Shri B. Akla it is apparent from the statement of the concerned workman in Ext. M-2 that probably he had used some abusive language and therefore the concerned workman was begging to be excused.

Now there are two versions in respect of the occurrence one version is that of the management which is stated in the chargesheet and the other version of the occurrence is in the statement of the concerned workman in Ext. M-2 which is reply to the chargesheet. The version of the management in the chargesheet is that Shri B. Akla had stopped his jeep at No. 4 area check post due to jamming of traffic when all on a sudden the concerned workman rushed to his Jeep No. BRY 3358, opened the right side door forcibly, started using filthy language to the officers of Bokaro

Colliery on some alleged grievance and when Shri B. Akla explained that it was not the proper place and time to put up those grievances the concerned workman became furious and took out his shoe with an intention to assault Shri Akla and it was only due to timely intervention of the security personnel at the check post that the assault on Shri Akla by the concerned workman was averted. The version of the concerned workman in his reply to the chargesheet in Ext. M-2 is that when the concerned workman was taking betal at the betal shop near No. 4 area check post facing west he was dashed by jeep from behind due to which he got hurt in his leg and was dashed towards betal shop and thereafter he caught hold of the gate of the jeep to see as to why was driving the jeep negligently and found that Shri Akla was driving the jeep. He has denied to have abused or misbehaved with Shri Akla. We have therefore to see to which of the version is correct and whether the management has been able to establish the version propounded by them in the chargesheet.

The management have examined Shri B. Akla MW-5 who is working as Dy. C.M.E. and Project Officer in Bokaro Colliery. He has stated that on 6-1-84 at about 1.15 P. M. he was going from his quarter to the hospital in a Jeep No. BRY 3358 along with his wife. He has stated that there was a traffic jam at the check post and as such he had to stop the jeep behind the truck. He has further stated that when he had stopped the jeep the concerned workman came from the shop on the right side and opened the right side gate of the jeep and that the concerned workman was very furious and started abusing and shouting at him and other officers of the colliery. He has stated that he was trying to close the door of the Jeep while the concerned workman was opening it again and again, and suddenly the concerned workman took his chappal in his right hand holding door of the vehicle and shouted to assault him with the chappal. He has stated that in the meantime the Security Personnel and drivers along with others came and tried to take away the concerned workman and removed the concerned workman applying some force. He proceeded to the hospital when the traffic jam was cleared. He has denied that he had driven the jeep over the leg of the concerned workman. He has also denied that he had used the reverse gear. In his cross-examination he has denied that he was driving his vehicle rashly and negligently and he has also denied that the concerned workman had approached him to show the injury. There is absolutely no evidence to show that Shri B. Akla was in any way prejudiced against the concerned workman or that he was nurturing any grievance from before against the concerned workman. The evidence of Shri Akla has remained in tact. His evidence clearly shows that the concerned workman had approached when his jeep was stopped at No. 4 area check post and wanted to open the gate of the jeep and had taken out his shoe in order to assault Shri Akla and was also abusing the officers of the colliery. MW-2 Shri Bachan Singh is the security guard at Bokaro Colliery. On 6-1-84 he was on duty at No. 4 area check post from 6 A.M. to 2 P.M. He has stated that there was a traffic jam at the check post between 1 and 1.30 P.M. He has further stated that when there was jam of trucks at the check post Shri Akla came on his jeep being driven by him and the jeep stopped behind the truck at the check post. MW-2 went near the jeep hearing some hulla and saw the concerned workman was trying to go to the jeep of Shri Akla and two or three persons were stopping the concerned workmen MW-2 also saw that the concerned workman was holding the handle of the jeep and this witness caught hold of the concerned workman and removed him from there. He also stated that the concerned workman was abusing the officers. He has stated that Shri Akla had not reversed his jeep and that the concerned workman had not made any complaint that Shri Akla had over run the wheel of the jeep on his leg. He had seen the concerned workman in anger at that time. He learnt that the concerned workman's calf had fallen down in a well in CCL and therefore he was angry on the officers that he had not maintained the well by raising its height. This witness had arrived after hearing hulla and he was not able to say as to what happened prior to the hulla. He has stated in his cross-examination that the concerned workman was saying that due to the negligence of the officers his calf had fallen in the well of CCL. He has also stated about the specific abuse being spoken by the concerned workman. It will thus appear from the evidence of MW-2 that the concerned workman was angry because the well was not being

properly maintained by the officers of the CCL and as a result of the negligence the calf of the concerned workman had fallen down in the well. It will appear from the evidence of MW-3 that some security person had come and removed the concerned workman and MW-2 is a Security Officer who claims to have removed the concerned workman from near the jeep of Shri Akla.

MW-3 Shri Basudeo Viswakarma is a Driver in Karoo Special Project which is by the side of Bokaro Colliery. On 6-1-84 he was in the tyre repairing shop of Nasiruddin at the check post. He has stated that there was a traffic jam at the check post between 1 and 1.30 P.M. and on hearing some hulla he saw the jeep of Shri Akla standing behind the truck at the barrier of the check post. He went near the jeep of Shri Akla and found the concerned workman abusing Shri Akla and other officers. He also saw the concerned workman holding the gate of the jeep and having shoe in his hand. He has stated that many persons arrived there and removed the concerned workman from there. He has also stated that the concerned workman did not say that Sh. Akla run over the tyre of his jeep at his leg. MW-3 therefore fully supports the case of the management. There is absolutely no reason as to why MW-3 would be deposing falsely against the concerned workman. MW-4 Nasiruddin has his tyre repairing shop near the check post. He has stated about the incident at the check post with Shri Akla. He has stated that at about 1 to 1.30 P.M. traffic was jammed at the check post and on hearing the alarm he went there and saw the concerned workman standing near the jeep of Shri Akla. He has stated that Sheopujan Singh was catching hold of the gate of Shri Akla and some people removed the concerned workman from that place and he also saw the concerned workman having chappal in his hand at that time who was also abusing that no arrangement has being made due to which his calf fell down in the well. He has further stated that the concerned workman did not say that Shri Akla had run over his jeep on his leg. He has testified the fact that Basudeo Viswakarma (MW-3) was also there at that time. In his cross-examination he has stated that he knew from before that two calves had fallen down in the well and had died. He has stated that the incident took place because of the death of the calf falling in the well. It will thus appear from the evidence of MW-3 that the concerned workman had caught hold of the gate of the jeep when Shri Akla had stopped the jeep near the check post because of the road jam and that the concerned workman was abusing the officers of the colliery and had taken out chappal in order to assault Shri Akla but he was prevented to do so by the persons who arrived there and removed the concerned workman from near the jeep of Shri Akla. It will also appear from the evidence that at that time the concerned workman had not stated to anybody that he had received injury in his leg by the jeep being driven by Shri Akla. Had the concerned workman received any injury in his leg with the jeep he must have stated so and there is no reason as to why the management's witnesses could not have stated of the injury of the concerned workman if he had received the same. The concerned workman has not produce any medical certificate to show that he had received injury in his leg. The explanation which the concerned workman has tried to give in his cross-examination that the doctor was prevented by Shri Akla not to examine and treat him appears to be a complete myth. The fact that the concerned workman had received injury with the jeep of Shri Akla does not find support from the evidence of the management's witnesses. It will also appear from the case of the concerned workman that he had received the injury with the jeep being driven by Shri Akla is not true which I will be discussing hereafter.

Ext. M-19 dated 17-7-84 is the application filed by Shri J. N. Das, Joint General Secretary of the Coal fields Labour Union to the AIC(C) Hazaribagh raising the Industrial Dispute in respect of the concerned workman. In para-3 of Ext. M-19 it is stated on behalf of the concerned workmen that when he recognised Shri Akla he said that had there been some other person he would not have allowed the Jeep to go away and Sheopujan Singh took off his shoes and showed the injury part to Shri Akla. It will thus appear that the concerned workman had taken off his shoes and had shown the injured part to Shri Akla. Taking off shoes by the concerned workman in his hand is thus admitted. The fact remains whether the concerned workman had taken off his shoe in order to show

the injuries which he had in his leg or whether he had taken off his shoe with an intention to assault Shri Akla. The concerned workman had been examined himself as WW-6 before this Court. He has stated that on 6-1-84 he had gone to No. 4 area for getting the tyre repaired at the shop of Nasiruddin. He has further stated that at that time the road was blocked and he was on the side of the road when the jeep of Shri Akla was stopped there due to the blockage of the road. He has further stated that when he wanted to cross road in order to go to the shop of Nasiruddin he got hurt with the jeep of Shri Akla while it was being backed by him. He has further stated that he went near the jeep of Shri Akla and told that he has been hurt in his leg by the jeep and he was showing his leg to Shri Akla. He has stated that he had taken out his shoe in order to show Shri Akla the injury in the leg and he had not abused Shri Akla at the time nor had raised his shoe in order to assault Shri Akla. He has also denied that he had told Shri Akla that his calf had fallen in the well due to the negligence on the part of the officer and that he had no reason to become angry with Shri Akla from before. In his cross-examination WW-6 has stated that he had stated all the facts relating to his defence in Ext. M-2 which he had filed in respect of the chargesheet served on him. He has stated that he had not got examined his injury by any doctor and he has given reason that Shri Akla had asked the doctor not to examine him and as such he was not examined by any doctor. He has admitted that he had not made any complaint before the General Manager that Shri Akla had injured him with his jeep and had asked the doctor not to examine him. He has further stated that he had not stated during the enquiry that Shri Akla had asked the doctor not to examine and treat him. It is clear therefore that he has come with a false allegation in his cross-examination that Shri Akla had asked the doctor not to examine. He has also admitted that he had given his statement before the Enquiry officer and his statements are from page-24 to the back of page 25 of Ext. M-13 bearing his signature. The concerned workman Shree Pujan Singh in his statement before the enquiry officer on 30-1-84 (Ext. M-13) has stated that on 6-1-84 at about 1.00 P.M. when he proceeded towards the tyre repairing shop of Nasiruddin towards the eastern side near No. 4 check post after taking betel from the nearby betel shop he was dashed from behind by a jeep from his left side. He has also stated that the traffic was jammed and vehicles were stopped at that place. He has further stated that he did not see that Shri Akla was driving his jeep. He has stated that he rushed towards the steering of the jeep of the right side and on seeing Shri Akla he showed the injured part of his right leg to Shri Akla and told him that when the traffic was jammed he should have driven his jeep after looking in the front and behind and that had there been any other person he would have behaved in a different way. He has also stated that if any abusive language had come out from his mouth it must have been because he had thought that some driver was driving the jeep but when he identified Shri Akla, he was very much ashamed. In his cross-examination before the enquiry officer he told that he got hurt with the Jeep BRY 3058 from behind in the west and he also got hurt in his right leg. On further cross-examination he has denied that he had taken off his shoe and that he only wanted to show his injury in his leg. He has also stated that he had got slight injury in his right leg and he wanted to show the said injury to Shri Akla, but many persons caught hold of him and did not allow him to show the injury to Shri Akla. WW-5M. Nasir has stated that the concerned workman was injured with the jeep of Akla Sahib. He has further stated that when Shree Pujan Singh got hurt, he went near Akla Sahib and showed his injured leg after putting off his shoe. WW-3 Md Yasin was coming out of his shop when he saw people collected by the side of the check post. He has stated that the jeep of Shri Akla came and stopped by the side of the road and when the jeep was being reversed the concerned workman got hurt in his leg by the side of the jeep. He has stated that the concerned workman had neither threatened nor taken out his chappal for assaulting Akla Sahib and he was simply showing his injury to Akla Sahib after taking out his chappal in his hand. WW-2 has stated that he was going to

work in the excavation section in Bokaro colliery at 1 P.M. through the check post when he saw the leg of Shri Shree Pujan Singh injured which he was showing to Shri Akla. He further stated that Shri Akla did not stop and went away on his jeep. He has stated that he did not see the concerned workman raising the shoe for assaulting Shri Akla. It will thus appear that there were different versions in respect of the alleged injury on the concerned workman while in Ext. M-2 it is stated that while the concerned workman was taking betel at the betel shop he was dashed from behind by the jeep and was pushed towards the betel shop but the concerned workman in his evidence as WW-6 has stated that when he wanted to cross the road in order to go to the shop of Nasiruddin he got hurt with the jeep of Shri Akla while being backed. It is clear from the evidence of the concerned workman that he is giving different versions only because the facts which are being stated by him are not correct and it was difficult for him to be consistent in his evidence regarding the alleged injury with the jeep as actually no injury had been caused to him by the jeep. The evidence of the witnesses examined on behalf of the workman do not at all appear to be truthful because of the varying statement.

In view of the facts evidence and circumstances discussed above I hold that the management has been able to establish that on 6-1-84 at about 1.15 P.M. when Shri B. Akla was passing No. 4 Area Check post and stopped there due to jam of traffic the concerned workman suddenly rushed to his jeep and tried to open the door of the jeep forcibly and started using filthy language to the officer of Bokaro Colliery as he had a grievance that the wells were not being maintained properly by the officer of the colliery due to which his calf had fallen down in the well. It will further appear that the concerned workman became furious and took out his shoe with the intention to assault Shri Akla but was prevented to assault Shri Akla as he was removed by the Security Persons and other persons who had assembled at that time

The management has referred to Ext.-5, Ext. 6 and Ext. 7 which were the exhibits marked by the enquiry officer to show that in the past also the concerned workman had committed the acts of misconduct. This was filed in order to show that the present act of misconduct committed by the concerned workman with Shri Akla was not the solitary one but even in the past the concerned workman had committed misconduct. I hold therefore that the charge levelled against the concerned workman has been established and he is guilty of the charge under clause 17(1)(g) and (r) of the certified standing orders Ext. M-18.

Clause 16 of the Certified standing order Ext. M-18, shows that a workman may be transferred due to exigency of work from one department to another or from one station to another or from one coal mine to another under same ownership. Thus the management has the power to transfer a workman from one colliery to the other under the same ownership. The concerned workman was transferred from Bokaro Colliery to Kargali colliery and thereafter he was transferred to Gidih Colliery and now he has been backed to Kargali Colliery and as such the concerned workman can have no grievance regarding the fact that he was transferred from one colliery to the other under the same ownership. The management was quite justified in transferring the concerned workman from one colliery to the other under its ownership

The workmen have claimed full wages for the period of suspension. Under clause 17 of the of the certified standing orders it is stated that a workman may be suspended pending departmental enquiry and in such cases he shall be paid a subsistence allowance equal to 1/2 of his wages as defined in the payment of wages Act, 1936 for the period his suspension upto 30 days and if however he is kept suspended by the management beyond 30 days this subsistence allowance will be at the rate of 3/4th of his wages as aforesaid. Clause 17(iii) provides that if a workman is not found guilty of the charges framed against him he shall

be deemed to be on duty during the full period of his suspension and he shall be entitled to receive the same wages as he would have received if he had not been suspended. It will thus be clear that it is only in the case when the concerned workman is not found guilty of the charges that he is entitled to the full wages for the period of his suspension. In case the concerned workman is found guilty it is unto the management to decide whether the concerned workman should be given full wages for the period of his suspension. In the present case the concerned workman has been found guilty of the charges and as such the concerned workman cannot claim as a right the full wages for the period of his suspension. The management was within their right not to pay the full wages to the concerned workman for the period of his suspension and I do not have any material to come to a different conclusion.

In the result, I hold that the action of the management of Bokaro Colliery of CCI in punishing the concerned workman Shri Sheo Pujan Singh and not paying him the wages in excess of subsistence allowance, demoting him to the post of Truck Khalasi from the post of Driver and transferring him is legal and justified. The concerned workman is therefore entitled to no relief.

This is my Award.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-24012/6/85-D IV(B)]  
R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

Dated : 28-5-87

नई दिल्ली, 23 जून, 1987

का.प्र. 1740.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एस. प्रसाद द्वारा बी.सी.सी.एल. कोयला भवन, शक़र कोयला नगर, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंधक के विरुद्ध उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 33ग (2) के अधीन दायर की गई शिकायत के संबंध में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रम मंत्रालय, धनबाद का पंचाट, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9 जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था, प्रकाशित करती है।

New Delhi, the 23rd June, 1987

S.O. 1740.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Labour Court, Dhanbad in respect of an application under section 33C(2) of the said Act filed by Shri S. Prasad against the management of B.C.C.L. Koyala Bhavan, P.O. Koyalnagar, District Dhanbad which was received by the Central Government on the 9th June, 1987.

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT LABOUR COURT AT DHANBAD

In the matter of an application under Section 33C(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Application No. LC 7 of 1986

#### PARTIES :

Shri Surendra Prasad, Mechanical Fitter BCCL, Mohuda Washery Project P.O. Mohuda, District Dhanbad (Bihar). Applicant.

#### Versus

Shri B. N. Prasad, General Manager (Personnel), Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Koyla Bhavan, P.O. Koyla Nagar, District Dhanbad ...Opp. Party.

#### APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the applicant—Shri Surendra Prasad, the applicant himself.

On behalf of the Opp. Party—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 3rd June, 1987

#### ORDER

This is an application under Section 33C(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by Shri Surendra Prasad, Mechanical Fitter,

BCCL Mohuda Washery Project, P.O. Mohuda, Dhanbad claiming certain dues of wages against the General Manager (Personnel), B.C.C. Ltd., Koyala Bhavan, P.O. Koyalnagar, Dhanbad.

The case of the applicant is that originally he was a permanent employee of Murulidih D.G. Station working in the capacity of Mechanical Fitter. An office order dated 19/21-12-83 was issued by the BCCL Headquarters transferring the applicant from D.G. Station to Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery. The applicant was released from his original place vide Office Order dated 31-12-83 with a direction to report for duty on 3-1-84 to Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery but he was not allowed to resume duty. Thereafter the applicant reported the matter to the different authorities of BCCL including its headquarters. Ultimately in supersession of the previous order another office order dated 16-2-84 was issued from BCCL headquarters transferring the applicant to Bhowra Area No. II with a direction to get the release order from the office of the D.G. Station Murulidih. As the applicant was issued a release order by the office of the D.G. Station Murulidih 20/21 Pits, the D.G. Office communicated that no further release order for Bhowra can be issued by the D.G. Station as the applicant had been issued release order earlier for 20/21 Pits. The applicant thus kept running to different officers for resumption of duty. Finally the release order was issued by the BCCL Headquarters on 25/26-4-84 and the same was given to the applicant on 10-5-84. Thereafter the applicant was allowed to join Bhowra area from 11-5-84. The applicant was kept idle by the management from 31-12-83 to 10-5-84 for no fault of his. The applicant therefore claimed to receive from the management wages and other benefits for the period of his voluntary idleness from 31st December, 1983 to 10th May, 1984. The management, however, after mutual settlement paid the wages and other fringe benefits for the period from 31-12-83 to 17-2-84 but the dues for the period from 18th February, 1984 to 10th May, 1984 was not paid. The applicant has therefore claimed the dues from the Opp. Party vide the details given in annexure to his application from 18-2-84 to 10-5-84 the total amount of claim being Rs. 3836.64 P.

The case of the Opp. Party is that due to certain difficulties the applicant could not be given job at Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery and as such his earlier transfer order was cancelled. The applicant was subsequently transferred to Bhowra Area. He had already been released from D.G. Station by order dated 31-12-83. But the applicant did not join at Bhowra Area as per order dated 16-2-84. As the applicant had already been released by order dated 31-12-83 there was no necessity of issuing any further release order. He was required to report for his duty at Bhowra Area along with order of transfer dated 16-2-84 and the release order dated 31-12-84 and he would have been allowed to resume his duties. The applicant did not report to his duty and when he wanted another release order from the headquarters the same was issued to him on 25/26-4-84. The applicant avoided to join Bhowra Area on some pretext but ultimately he joined. The applicant had reported for duty at Murulidih 20/21 Pits on 3-1-84 but he was not allowed to join his duties at that place and thereafter he was subsequently transferred to Bhowra Area. The management passed the necessary order for payment of his salary upto 16-2-84. As the applicant did not join his duties at Bhowra Area on the basis of transfer order dated 16-2-84 he was not entitled to wages for the subsequent period and hence the management has not sanctioned for the payment of his salary from 16-2-84 till the date of his joining at Bhowra Area. The order of transfer was sent to the applicant through post and the copies were displayed at the gates of the residents by the Peon. In spite of his transfer to Bhowra Area the applicant did not join there as a result of which he did not earn wage for the said period of his absence. The applicant is not entitled to the wages from 18-2-84 till 10-5-84 amounting to Rs. 3386.64 P. as claimed by him.

The only point for decision in this case is whether the applicant is entitled to the amount being claimed by him for the period from 18-2-84 to 10-9-84.

The applicant has examined himself as WW. 1 The management did not examine any witness in support of his case. The documents on behalf of the applicant are marked Ext. W-1 to W-10. No document has been produced on behalf of the management.



It will appear from the pleadings of the parties that the applicant received the wages for the period from 31-12-83 to 17-2-84 and the present claim relates only for the period from 18-2-84 to 10-5-84 which admittedly has not been paid. WW-1 Surendra Prasad has stated that he was transferred in December, 1973 to Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery and that he was released from Murulidih D.G. Station with a direction to join 20/21 Pits Colliery. He has stated that he gave his joining report to Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery on 3-1-84 but he was not allowed to join on that day and the Acting Dy. C. M. E. told him that he would pass orders for his joining after two or 3 days. He has stated that he received a letter from Dy. C.M.E. by which he refused to allow the applicant to join at 20/21 Pits Murulidih Colliery. He met Dy. C.M.E. personally and gave him in writing for allowing him to join but he was told that his prayer for joining had already been refused and that he should contact the headquarters. He has stated that thereafter he met Shri B. N. Prasad, General Manager (P) at the headquarters who asked him to meet Shri S. N. P. Sinha, Personnel Manager (Man power). He has stated that he contacted Shri Sinha who told him that he would make decision after contacting the General Manager (Personnel) and thereafter he would give information. He has stated that after sometime he had met Shri V. Manohar, Director Personnel who told him to file an application. He has stated that there after he received the order for his transfer to Bhowra Area in which it was written that he could join at Bhowra Area after being released from D.G. Station Murulidih and thereafter he contacted Shri B.K. Singh Engineer Incharge, D.G. Station Murulidih who told him that he had already released the applicant on 31-12-83 and that he will not issue another release order. WW-1 has further stated that Shri B. K. Singh told him that he has written to the Dy. Personnel Manager for guidance in the matter and that the applicant should wait till the reply is received. The applicant thereafter received the release order along with photo copy of transfer issued by BCCL headquarters on 25-26-4-84 and then the applicant joined on 11-5-84. He has admitted to have received his salary till 17-2-84. He has also stated in his cross-examination that he was getting his wages regularly from 11-5-84. Thus his claim is for his salary from 18-2-84 to 10-5-84. Ext. W-1 dt. 19/21-12-83 is the office order by which the applicant was transferred from D.G. Station Murulidih to Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery. It will show that the applicant was to obtain his release order from his controlling officer and thereafter should report to the Engineer Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery. Ext. W-2 dated 31-12-83 is the office order issued by the Engineer Incharge D.G. Station. It shows that the applicant was released from the D.G. Station Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery. Ext. W-3 dated 5/6-1-84 shows that the applicant had given his joining report dated 3-1-84 at Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery but his joining report was not accepted by the Dy. C.M.E. Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery. Ext. W-4 dated 22/24-1-84, Ext. W-5 dated 24-2-84, and Ext. W-6 dated 27-2-84 are the applications filed by the applicant to the Dy. C.M.E./Manager Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery for allowing him to join but the applicant was not allowed to join 20/21 Pits Colliery. However Ext. W-7 dated 16-2-84 shows that the transfer order dated 19/21-12-83 (Ext. W-1) was superseded and the applicant was transferred to Bhowra Area. In this office order the applicant was asked that he should obtain the release order from D.G. Station Murulidih and thereafter he should join Bhowra Area. It appears that the management felt that the applicant was wrongly stopped from joining 20/21 Pits when he gave his joining report on 3-1-84 after his transfer from D.G. Station Murulidih Colliery to 20/21 Pits Murulidih Colliery and therefore the office order Ext. W-7 was issued on 16-2-84 and the applicant was paid his salary from 31-12-83 to 17-2-84.

Ext. W-8 dated 17-2-84 is a letter written by the Engineer (E&M) Incharge, D.G. Station Murulidih to B. K. Singh Dy. Personnel Manager (Man power) Karmik Bhawan. It will appear from this letter that in response to the previous office order dated 19/21-12-83 the applicant had already been released from D.G. Station Murulidih from 2-1-84 as per the release order and after getting the release order the applicant had already left the D.G. Station Murulidih since 8-1-84 for reporting for his duty at his new place of posting at 20/21 Pits Colliery and as such there was no question for release of the applicant again from D.G. Station Murulidih. It was requested that his matter may be looked into deeply and necessary amendment/rectification be made in the

office order dated 16-2-84. It appears that this letter Ext. W-8 was written to the Dy. P.M. man power Karmik Bhawan on receipt of the office order dated 16-2-84 (W-7) in which there was a direction that the applicant should get release order from D.G. Station Murulidih and thereafter should report to the General Manager, Bhowra Area, Ext. W-9 dated 25/26-4-84 was issued by the P. M. (Man power) in which it is stated that the applicant has been transferred to Bhowra area in supersession of the previous transfer order dated 19/21-12-83 and in pursuance of the said office order the applicant stands released with immediate effect and he was directed to report for duty to the General Manager Bhowra Area. It appears therefore that the applicant could not join Bhowra Area as there was a direction in the office order dated 16-2-84 to obtain a release order from D. G. Station Murulidih but the Engineer Incharge of D. G. Station did not issue a fresh release order as he had already issued release order when the applicant was transferred from D. G. Station to 20/21 Pits vide Office order dated 19/21-12-83. The applicant therefore could not join Bhowra area prior to the issuance of Ext. W-9, dated 25/26-4-84 and it was not possible for him to join there as he was already making efforts to obtain release order from Engineer Incharge D.G. Station. Thus he was prevented from joining Bhowra Area and it was only after the issuance of the office order Ext. W-9 that it could be possible for the applicant to join Bhowra Area. Ext. W-10 dated 21/22-5-84 is an office order which shows that in pursuance of office order dated. 15-5-84 from the P. M. Bhowra area the applicant was allowed to join w.e.f. 15-5-1984. The letter dated 15-5-84 from the Personnel Manager Bhowra has not been filed by the management. However it is clear that it was only after this office order that the applicant was allowed to join with effect from 15-5-84 at Bhowra Area. It appears therefore that the applicant was prevented from joining at Bhowra Area for some reason or other and that the applicant had not wilfully absented to join Bhowra area. In the above view of the matter I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled for the salary from 18-2-84 to 10-5-84 as there is no fault on the part of the applicant in joining at Bhowra Area and that it was because of the order of the management that the applicant could not join during the period 18-2-84 to 10-5-84. The applicant has claimed a gross amount of Rs. 3551.64 in the details of his claim attached with his application and I think the said amount has to be paid to the applicant by the Opposit Party. The applicant has claimed P. F. amounting to Rs.285/- which the applicant is entitled but the said amount cannot be paid to him but has to be deposited in his account in C. M. P. F. The opposit Party has not shown that the above claim made by the applicant is wrongly calculated.

In the result, the Opposit Party is directed to pay Rs. 3551.64P. to the applicant and to deposit Rs. 285/- to his C. M. P. F. account for the period from 18-2-84 to 10-5-84.

Order is passed accordingly.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20025/6/87-D.III (A)]

P. V. SREEDHARAN, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 1987

का.प्रा. 1741.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत सरकार प्रोडक्शन सेक्टरस, ऐट्टमानूर डिस्ट्रिक्ट कोर्टम (केराला) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुव-ध से निर्विष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, क्वीलोन के पंचाट की प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8 जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1987

S.O. 1741.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Quilon, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Government of India Production Centres, Ettumanoor Distt. Kottayam (Kerala) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th June, 1987.

IN THE COURT OF THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
QUILON

(Dated, this the 27th day of May, 1987)

PRESENT:

C. N. Sasidharan Industrial Tribunal.

IN

Industrial Dispute No. 5/87

BETWEEN

The Director, Government of India Production Centres,  
Ettumanoor, Kottayam District, Kerala.

(By Sri Santhalingam, Advocate, Kottayam.)

AND

The General Secretary, Central Government Small Scale  
Industries Organisation Employees Union, Ettu-  
manoor, Kottayam District (Kerala).

AWARD

The Government of India by Order No. J-42011/1/81-  
D.II(B) dated 5-3-1987 has referred this Industrial Dispute  
for adjudication to this Tribunal. The issues involved are:

- (1) "Whether the Director of the Government of India Production Centres, Ettumanoor was justified in fixing 36 Helper Mistries recruited in 1971-72 as Mistries at minimum of the scales 110-155 after one year of their service in the lower scale, or whether they should have been given a higher start in the scale as per their appointment orders. If so, what should be their initial fixation in the scale 110—155 and consequent entitlements?"
- (2) "Whether the Mistries under the Director, Government of India Production Centres, Ettumanoor should be provided with promotional opportunities, and if so, what should be the proportion of higher posts, the scale of pay and the criteria/conditions for promotion to such posts?"
- (3) "Whether the demand of Helpers under the Director, Government of India Production Centre, Ettumanoor for quasi-permanency, confirmation, provision of uniforms, gratuity, pension and other service benefits applicable to regular employees is legal and justified? If so, to what extent and subject to what conditions."
- (4) "Whether the action of the Director, Government of India Production Centres, Ettumanoor in non-regularisation of the suspension period from 15-2-74 to 14-7-74 in r/o Shri V. Bhaskaran, Helper, after he was re-instated and further non-payment of wages to him is in order? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"
- (5) "Whether the demand for payment of bonus to the workmen of the Production Centre, Ettumanoor under the payment of Bonus Act, is justified? If yes, to what relief the said workman are entitled to?"

2. Notices were sent to the Union and Management. The union entered appearance through its Secretary and the management through counsel. The union files its statement on 28-4-1987 and the case was posted to today for reply statement of the management. Today when it was taken up the management and union remained absent. There was no representation also on behalf of the parties.

3. Since both sides remained absent it has to be presumed that there is no dispute now subsisting to be adjudicated upon.

4. I therefore, find that there is no subsisting dispute for adjudication between the parties.

An award is passed accordingly.

C. N. SASIDHARAN, Industrial Tribunal  
[No. L-42011/1/81-D.II(B)]

का.भा. 1742.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पी एंड टी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10 जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1742.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of P&T and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL;  
NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 41/85

In the matter of dispute between

Shri Suresh Kumar S/o Shri Hari Chand.  
H. No. F. 82, Katwaria Sarai,  
New Delhi.

Versus

Asstt. Superintendent of Post Offices,  
Kalkaji Post Office, New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri H. S. Vats—for the workman.

Shri Narinder Chaudhary—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-40012(5)/85-D.II(B) dated 6th September, 1985 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Suresh Kumar Muster Roll Postman on 21-1-84 by the Post and Telegraph Department Delhi is legal & justified? If not, to what relief the workman entitled?"

2. The case of the workman is that he remained employed with the Post and Telegraph Department Delhi from September, 1980 to 21-1-84 and had put in a total of 813 days of service, and his services were illegally terminated on 21-1-84 without serving any notice and paying him any wages in lieu of notice or retrenchment compensation, and there was violation of section 25-F of the I.D. Ac. The workman also alleged arbitrariness and discrimination because one Uma Shankar who was employed with him was allowed to continue and S/Shri Vijay Kumar and Virender Singh were reinstated whereas the workman was deprived of the opportunity to serve the Management.

3. The Management in its written statement raised the preliminary objection that the respondent Department of Post and Telegraph is not an Industry. It was further submitted that the claimant was working on a daily wages unapproved postman on purely temporary basis against short term leave vacancies on declaration/undertaking that he will work only as daily wage basis and his services could be terminated at any time. Hence its action of the Management was justified.

4. The preliminary objections of the Management that the respondent department is not an industry or that the provisions of section 25-F of the I.D. Act are not applicable to casual workman like the claimant, have been answered in the authority Bhaskaran and others Vs. Sub Divisional Officer and others F.J.R. Vol. 61 page 109 Kerala High Court as under :

"Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, Section 2(a), (g), (i) (n), (s) 9-A, 10, 22, 25-F and 25-H—'Industry'. Definition of—includes Government Department unless



Excluded by Law—Posts and Telegraph Department is an "Industry" provisions of chapter V-A of Act Apply to workmen of the Department Services of Casual workers cannot be terminated without complying with Section 25-F.

Sections 2(a), 2(g), 2(n), 2(o), 9-A, 10 and 22 and the proviso to section 17A and its entries in the First Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, all indicate that the provisions of the Act will apply to Governmental activities also if such activities are of the nature to which the Act would otherwise apply. The postal, telegraph and telephone services are named public utility services and as such they are industries to which the provisions of sections 10, 12 and 22 of the Act directly apply. Therefore, it cannot be contended that the Posts and Telegraphs Department of the Government of India is not an "industry" under the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

if one is able to infer from the definition of "industry", read with the other provisions of the Act, that every organised activity carried on with the co-operation of employers and employees for production of goods or for rendering services is an industry, the yardstick has to be applied to Governmental activities also unless any exception is recognised by the Act itself or other laws. That the State itself is not ready to make such exemption is indicated by the Industrial Disputes Amendment Bill, 1982, in which the definition of "industry" has been so amended as to exclude any governmental activities relating to sovereign functions, including Departmental activities of the Central Government dealing with "defence, research, atomic energy and space". The powers that be are apparently still unwilling to protect the Posts and Telegraphs Department from the invasion of industrial law.

Sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H appear in Chapter V-A of the Act and section 25-J provides that the provisions of this Chapter shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in any other law (including Standing Orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act 1947. Therefore, the provisions of sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H have an overriding effect and anything inconsistent contained in any other law, which must necessarily include Service Rule of Government employees, cannot be given effect to. They have simply to be ignored if the establishment is an "industry". It cannot, therefore, be contended that even if a department of the Government is an "industry" as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, its employees governed by Service Rules framed under article 309 of the Constitution stand outside the fold of the Act.

Therefore, casual mazdoor employed by the Posts and Telegraphs Department are unskilled workers in an "industry" whose services cannot be terminated except in accordance with the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Orders of termination passed without regard to the said provision will have no effect."

5. Now it is admitted by MFW-1 Shri Rajeshwar Lal Assistant from the Post Office Central Sub-Division South East Srinivas Puri, New Delhi that the services of the workman were terminated on 21-1-84 and that he had put in more than 240 days in the 12 calendar months preceding to the date of his termination and that no notice was served upon the workman nor any wages in lieu of notice nor any re-employment compensation were paid to him. Thus on admitted facts there is clear violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act and the termination of the workman is held to be illegal and void ab initio. It is therefore, directed that the workman should be reinstated with continuity of service and with full back wages.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this Award may be forwarded to the Central Government for necessary action at their end.

Dated - 19th May, 1987.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-40012/5/85-D.II (B)]

क. भा 1743.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिभिजनल इंजीनियर टेलीग्राफ (पीएच टी) अमरावती के प्रबन्धन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध से निरूपित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10 जून 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1743.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telegraphs (P & T) Amravati and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)  
Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(88) of 1984

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Divisional Engineer Telegraphs (P & T), Amravati Division, Amravati (M.S.) and their workmen S/Shri Abdul Jalil S/o Abdul Majid, Dharamraj S/o Bhimrao Kamalpure and S. K. Yakub S/o S. K. Juman, Casual Mazdoors represented by All India Telegraphs Engineering Employees Union, Class III Trunk Exchange, Amravati (M.S.)

#### APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri V. K. Sule.

For Management—Shri M. G. Kalambe, D.E.T. Amravati.

INDUSTRY : Telegraphs, DISTRICT : Amravati (M.S.)

#### AWARD

Dated : June 3, 1987

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-40012(7)/84-D.II(B) dated 31st October, 1984 and subsequent Corrigendum of even notification number dated 20-3-1985 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Whether the action of the management of Divisional Engineer, Telegraph, Amravati in terminating the service of S/Shri Abdul Jalil S/o Abdul Majid, Dharamraj S/o Bhimrao Kamalpure and S. K. Yakub S/o S. K. Juman, Casual Mazdoors with effect from 20-3-1970 is justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?"

2. Facts in this case are not very much dispute. Facts which are no longer in dispute are that all these three casual mazdoors worked under S.D.O. (Phones) Amravati Abdul Jalil and S. K. Yakub worked from October 1971 and Dhanraj (alias Dharamraj Kamalpure from June 1972 respectively for 1799, 1387 and 1480 days till 18-3-1980. On 18-3-1980 they were arrested on the report of Sectional Telephone Engineer of Amravati for an offence under Sec. 379 I.P.C. and released on bail next day. They were tried and were acquitted for the offence of the alleged theft of telephone poles vide judgment dated 12-1-1981 of the criminal court. These workmen applied for being taken on duty but they were not so taken and therefore the matter was referred to higher authorities. The workman after giving notice of hunger strike went on hunger strike which lasted for five days from 16-7-1981 to 30-7-1981. However, on the oral assurance of D.E.T. Amravati the strike was given up. Abdul Jalil and Dharamraj were asked to work under S.D.O. Telegraphs, Amravati and S. K. Yakub was asked to go to Yeotmal to work under S.D.O. Telegraphs, Yeotmal. However, they were treated as new recruits and were paid at the low rate of Rs. 8 per day. These workmen were again removed from service orally sometimes in

September-October, 1981. The management on 24-12-1981 issued a notification for recruitment of Group D test and non-test category against 1981 quota. These workmen applied for their recruitment and were placed in the approved list at serial no. 30, 40 and 41. But their break in service was not condoned and they were not considered eligible for recruitment.

3. It is also not disputed that neither a month's notice or pay in lieu of notice or retrenchment compensation was given to these workmen when on both occasions they were discharged from service.

4. Case of the workmen further is that to make place for the junior persons these workmen were falsely implicated in the criminal case by the officials posted at Amravati. Immediately on being released or bail next day they reported on duty but they were not allowed to do so and were orally informed that their services have been terminated with effect from 20-3-1980 by the S.D.O. (Phones) Amravati. After acquittal also they made repeated request orally and in writing but the management gave no reply. Therefore they had to resort to 'hunger strike'. In September-November, 1981 when the workmen demanded wages at the higher rate they were removed on the false pretexts. Shri Dhanraj (alias Dharamraj) was removed on the ground that he was junior and Abdul Jalil was removed on the allegations that he provoked other mazdoors for union activities and S. K. Yakub was removed without assigning any reason. At the time of recruitment the word "provisional" was mentioned against the names of these applicants for which they made representation to the General Manager, Bombay. But their representation was turned down because D.E.T. Amravati had misrepresented the facts that these workmen remained absent at their own accord, hence they were not allowed to join duties. Therefore the D.M.T. Bombay expressed his inability to condone their 'break in service'. Similarly their application for another recruitment in Group D test and non test category which had taken place on 31-6-1982 was also rejected.

5. The case of the management is that the workmen had committed theft of P.M.T. Stores and the criminal case was started on the report of Sectional Telephone Engineer. They were not falsely implicated. Their services were also not orally terminated. The workmen were not acquitted honourably, hence the management considered their integrity doubtful and did not consider them fit for duty. Yet they had referred their case to the higher authorities. The hunger strike was unfair act on the part of the workmen, therefore the management intervened and asked them to desist. However, D.E.T. (Phones) Amravati gave an understanding that they will be re-employed according to administrative convenience and they were so re-employed and paid according to rates in force at that time. They were removed from service again because their work and conduct was unsatisfactory and of provocative nature.

6. The break in service could not be condoned because rules did not permit. Therefore, they were not considered for recruitment. No wrong representation was made to D.M.T. Bombay. Since the acquittal of these workmen was on benefit of doubt therefore the management did not consider them fit for re-employment.

7. As I have already pointed out that the facts of the case are not very much in dispute. On the disputed points parties have adduced evidence and relied on certain documents.

8. Shri V. D. Mahore (WW-1) the Secretary of the All India Telegraph Engineering Employees has stated that they had taken the demand of reinstatement of these workmen and that the management had told them that since they are prosecuted criminally they can be reinstated only after the case is over. So when they were acquitted they again approached the authority but nobody listen to them. So ultimately the workers and the union went on hunger strike. Then the Divisional Engineer, Shri S. K. Moitra, negotiated the matter and he assured that these workers will be taken up in the employment and they should give up hunger strike. He with his own hands gave the juice which is shown in the photo Ex. W-1. These workmen were taken up in service for few days and that too in different places. After a couple of days their services were again verbally terminated without

giving them any notice, compensation etc. His statement has not been challenged in cross-examination. Therefore there is no reason to disbelieve his testimony.

9. On behalf of the management the then S.D.O. (Phones) Shri A. S. Dedhe and the Divisional Engineer (Telephones) Shri S. K. Moitra have been examined. Shri A. S. Dedhe has stated that on the complaint of their neighbours police raided the house of the workmen and found telephone poles in their houses. Police prosecuted and arrested them and ultimately they were acquitted giving benefit of doubt. After acquittal they came in July 1981 for re-employment but since six months had elapsed he could not give them employment. He therefore forwarded their application to the D.E. (T). Thereafter he was transferred so he does not know what transpired. He has further stated that during court case neither workmen nor union approached for their employment. In cross-examination he has admitted that the neither gave any notice nor compensation to these workmen on termination. The workmen had gone on hunger strike in July 1981.

10. Shri S. K. Moitra, D.E. (T), has admitted in his examination-in-chief that on the conduct of being involved in theft case S.D.O. (Phones) terminated their services and on the basis of his report he had submitted his report Ex. M-1 to the General Manager, Telecom Bombay. In cross-examination he belied the statement of Shri A. S. Dedhe and initial stand of management, when he stated that after their acquittal S.D.O. (Telephones) refused to take them on duty because his contention was that their integrity is doubtful. Then the Union leader Shri Sule approached him and told him that the workmen had reported on duty after being released but the S.D.O. (Phones) refused to take them on duty.

11. The Union has also relied on certain admitted documents. Letter Ex. M-1 goes to show that Shri S. K. Moitra had referred the case of these workmen to G.M.T. Bombay asking whether he is competent to condone the broken spell in this particular case looking to the facts and circumstances of the case. General Manager, Telecom, Bombay declined to condone the broken spell vide letter Ex. W-7. Therefore Shri Moitra wrote Ex. W-12=Ex. W-6 to S.D.O. (Phones) informing the above. The Union had represented their case vide letter Ex. W-10 and thereafter there was a meeting of the Union and management's representative on 9-11-1981 (Ex. W-11). In that meeting also item No. 23 and 24 go to show that the management refused to condone the broken period of service but had assured them that the matter will be taken up on higher level yet Shri Dhanraj (alias Dharamraj) was removed being the junior labourer. In other words his broken service period was also not taken in account. Ex. W-2 is the representation dated 2-12-1980 of Shri S. K. Kakub. The other two workmen had also filed similar representations. Ex. W-3 is the notice of 'hunger strike' in Marathi and Ex. W-4 is its acknowledgment letter. Ex. W-5 is the letter of appointment @ Rs. 8 per day after acquittal.

12. Shri Sule, representative of the workmen, has filed a statement Ex. W-1 (which is admitted by the management) showing the service details pertaining to these three casual labourers who were orally terminated with effect from 20-3-1980. Now from the statement of Shri S. K. Moitra it is also proved beyond doubt that the services of these workmen were orally terminated with effect from 20-3-1980 and it is not true that the stand of the S.D.O. (T) Shri A. S. Dedhe was correct that they had themselves absented from work. From the statement of Shri Moitra it is further proved that they were considered for employment in category D and were in fact employed but they were placed at the lowest level because their break in service (though for no fault of theirs) was not condoned. Therefore they were not considered eligible for re-employment and their services were again terminated on flimsy or no ground at all (See Ex. W-11 dated 9-11-1981 item No. 24). Ex. W-8 is the notice of recruitment for the post of Group D test and non test category. Since the broken period of these workmen were not condoned they were held not eligible for the recruitment as is apparent from letter Ex. W-9 of the D.E.T. Amravati. This means that these persons were debarred and declared not eligible for the test in which other new or junior employees were taken to fill up the permanent post).

13. From the above, two factors emerge out. Firstly that admittedly the services of these workmen were orally terminated because they were involved in a criminal case. Therefore they are not re-employed (except for some period in different places) and they were not considered eligible for recruitment because the broken service period was not condoned and according to the management their acquittal was not a clean acquittal.

14. I have gone through the judgment dated 12-1-1981. According to the prosecution case the only evidence against these workmen was that in their presence the stolen poles were recovered from the house of accused Dharamraj on 18-3-1980, while the report of their was lodged next day on 19-3-1980. In this connection para 6 of the judgment reproduced below is relevant:—

"Thus from the evidence on record it is very difficult to hold that the accused persons are the authors of theft of telephone poles, which theft occurred on 17 to 18-3-1980 in Tulkheddi area. Primarily all the three accused other than Dharamraj have not been identified by the P.G.I. who raided the house of Dharamraj. So the fact that they were at the house of Dharamraj when seizure of telephone poles was effected is not at all established. No other witness has stated to have been a/cd. to 4 possessing of cutting telephone poles at the house of Dharamraj. Hence their implication in the charge of theft is very much doubtful. They deserve to be given benefit of doubt as such. Accordingly they are acquitted from the charge of theft."

From the above, it is crystal clear that there is no question of doubt. In fact, there was not an iota of evidence against the other two workmen viz. S. K. Yakub and Abdul Jalil because their identity at the time of recovery of so called stolen property is not at all proved. Independent witnesses were hostile. There is no legal evidence against these two workmen. In the circumstances, the management should have had no hesitation in employing these two workmen, S. K. Yakub and Abdul Jalil at least.

15. However, even if I leave out this aspect of the case fact remains that the services of these workmen were terminated without any notice or one month's pay in lieu of notice or without retrenchment compensation as required under Section 25F of the I. D. Act. It is admitted fact that these workmen had worked for number of days mentioned in Ex. W/1 viz. Dharamraj (alias Dharamraj) and S. K. Yakub and Abdul Jalil respectively from June, October, 1971 and July 1972 to 19-3-1980 for 1480, 1387 and 1799 days. Therefore the case clearly falls under Sec. 25B and Sec. 25F of the I. D. Act. In the case of Mohan Lal Versus Management of M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd. (AIR 1981 SC 1263) to Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:—

"Niceties and semantics apart, termination by the employer of the services of a workman for any reason whatsoever would constitute retrenchment except in cases in the section itself."

Admittedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Sec. 25F of the Act therefore the retrenchment of workmen is void ab initio. As a normal rule once the termination is found to be void ab initio the workmen are entitled to reinstatement. In the instant case, the plea of the management for not taking them back in service is that their acquittal was not honorable. This is not true as their services were terminated not because their acquittal was not honorable, but because they were involved in a criminal case. Such a course is not warranted as has been held in the case of Workmen of Calcutta Dock Labourers Board and Another and Employers in relation to Calcutta Dock Labour Board and Others and Vice Versa (1973 SC 11 P 90), as under:—

"Where the workmen concerned were detained under the Defence of India Rules the principle laid down by the Supreme Court in Calcutta Dock Labour Board v. Jaffar Imam would become applicable.

In that case it was held that if the employer wanted to take disciplinary action on the ground

that the employee was guilty of misconduct, it was absolutely essential that a proper enquiry should be held instead of equating the detention to a conviction by Criminal Court."

It is now well settled that the management should allege and prove loss of confidence. In this case, the management has nowhere pleaded or proved that they have lost of confidence in these workmen. Loss of confidence and dishonorable acquittal are not the same thing. Therefore, I am of the opinion that reinstatement with full back wages is the proper relief which ought to be granted to these workmen. In any case, the plea that they did not re-employ them because their integrity was doubtful falls to the ground, because the management in fact did re-employ them, though for a short while.

16. For the reasons discussed above, I therefore, hold and answer the reference as under:—

That the action of the management of Divisional Engineer, Telegraph, Amravati in terminating the service of S/Shri Abdul Jalil S/o Abdul Majid, Dharamraj S/o Bhimrao Kamalpure and S. K. Yakub S/o S. K. Jumman, Casual mazdoors with effect from 20-3-1980 is not justified. Workmen are, therefore, entitled to be reinstated with effect from 20-3-1980 with full back wages and all other ancillary benefits including continuity of service and they will be placed below all the so far regularised workmen. However, for the period they were re-employed and paid Rs. 8 per day they will get the difference of pay only. Management will further pay Rs. 500 to each workman as costs of these proceedings. Management will comply with this order within three months from the date of this order otherwise it will carry interest @ 9 per cent per annum

[No. L-40012/7/84-D.II(B)]

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

का अा 1711—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पोस्ट्स एंड टेलीग्राफ के प्रबन्धन में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नई दिल्ली के पञ्चपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10 जन, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1744.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Post & Telegraphs and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 8/86

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Bal Kishan,  
H. No. 293, Village Davli,  
P.O. Madangir,  
New Delhi-62.

Versus

Asstt. Superintendent of  
Post Offices,  
Kalkaji Post Office,  
New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri H. S. Vats—for the workman

Shri Narinder Chaudhary—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-40012(29)/84-D.II(B) dated 1-10-85 has

referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether action of the Sr. Suptd. of Post Offices, New Delhi in not permitting Shri Bal Kishan to appear in the test for regularisation even though he had worked as a daily wages postman from 1980 to 1984 and further in terminating his services w.e.f. 19-1-84 is legal and justified ? If not to what relief the workman entitled ?"

2. The case of the workman is that he remained employed with the Post and Telegraph Department Delhi from 25-8-80 to 19-1-84 and had put in a total of 880 days of service, and his services were illegally terminated on 19-1-84 without serving any notice and paying him any wages in lieu of notice or retrenchment compensation, and there was violation of section 25-F of the I.D. Act. The workman also alleged arbitrariness and discrimination because one Uma Shankar who was employed with him was allowed to continue whereas the workman was deprived of the opportunity to serve the Management.

3. The Management in its written statement raised the preliminary objection that the respondent Department of Post and Telegraphs is not an Industry. It was further submitted that the claimant was working as a daily wages unapproved postman on purely temporary basis against short term leave vacancies on declaration/undertaking that he will work only on daily wage basis and his services could be terminated at any time. Hence the action of the Management was justified.

4. The preliminary objection of the Management that the respondent department is not an industry or that the provisions of section 25-F of the I.D. Act are not applicable to casual workmen like the claimant, have been answered in the authority Bhaskaran and others Vs. Sub-Divisional Officer and others F.J.R. Vol. 61 page 109 Kerala High Court as under :

"Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Sections 2(a), (g), (j), (n), (s) 9-A, 10, 22, 25-F and 25-H" Industry, Definition of-Includes Government Departments unless excluded by Law-Posts and Telegraphs Department-is an "Industry"-Provisions of Chapter V-A of Act Apply to workmen of the Department-Services of casual workers cannot be terminated without complying with Section 25-F.

Sections 2(a), 2(g), 2(n), 2(s), 9-A, 10 and 22 and the proviso to section 17A and the entries in the First Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, all indicate that the provisions of the Act will apply to Governmental activities also if such activities are of the nature to which the Act would otherwise apply. The postal, telegraph and telephone services are named public utility services and as such they are industries to which the provisions of sections 10, 12 and 22 of the Act directly apply. Therefore, it cannot be contended that the Posts and Telegraphs Department of the Government of India is not an "industry" under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

If one is able to infer from the definition of "industry", read with the other provisions of the Act, that every organised activity carried on with the co-operation of employers and employees for production of goods or for rendering services in an industry, the yardstick has to be applied to Governmental activities also unless any exemption is recognised by the Act itself or other laws. That the State itself is not ready to make such exemption is indicated by the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1982, in which the definition of "industry" has been so amended as to exclude any governmental activities relating to sovereign functions", including departmental activities of the Central Government dealing with "defence, research atomic energy and space". The powers that be are apparently still unwilling to protect the Posts and Telegraphs Department from the invasion of industrial law.

Section 25-P, 25-G and 25-H appear in Chapter V-A of the act and section 25-J provides that the provision of this Chapter shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in any other law (including Standing Orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1947. Therefore, the provisions of section 25-P, 25-G and 25-H have an overriding effect and anything inconsistent contained in any other law, which must necessarily include Service Rules of Government employees, cannot be given effect to. They have simply to be ignored if the establishment is an industry as defined in the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, its employees governed by Service Rules framed under article 309 of the Constitution stand outside the fold of the Act.

Therefore, casual mazdoor employed by the Posts and Telegraphs Department are unskilled workers in an "industry" whose services can not be terminated except in accordance with the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Orders of termination passed without regard to the said provisions will have no effect."

5. Now it is admitted by MW-1 Shri Rajeshwar Lal Assistant from the Post Office Central Sub-Division South East Srinivas Puri, New Delhi that the services of the workmen were terminated on 19-1-84 and that he had put in more than 240 days in the 12 calendar months preceding to the date of his termination and that no notice was served upon the workman for any wages in lieu of notice nor any retrenchment compensation were paid to him. Thus on admitted facts there is clear violation of the provisions of Section 25-P of the I. D. Act and the termination of the workman is held to be illegal and void-ab initio. It is, therefore, directed that the workman should be reinstated with continuity of service and with full back wages.

6. As regards the first part of the issue in the terms of reference as to whether the action of the management in not permitting the workman to appear in the test for regularisation even though he has worked as a daily wages postman from 1980 to 1984 was legal and justified, the bonus was squarely on the Management. However, the Management has not gone beyond the verbal denial that the workman is qualified for absorption in the postal department or that after orders to serve with the respondents he may be considered for regular appointment. It has further been averred that this cannot be done because the petitioner is not qualified for the post according to recruitment rules of the respondent and the vacancies have to be filled from the departmental examination for direct recruitment after holding the written test and other tests etc. according to rules and it depends upon the vacancies from time to time. The Management for reasons best known to it has not cared to place on record the relevant recruitment rules and as to what are the qualifications required nor have they specified the particular qualifications which the workman lacks. Under the circumstances at adverse inference must be drawn against the Management and it is held that the action of the Management in not permitting the workman to appear in the test for regularisation is not justified.

7. This reference stands disposed off accordingly.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this Award may be forwarded to the Central Govt. for necessary action at their end.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer

19th May, 1987.

[No. 1 40012/29/84-D.II(B)]

का.प्रा. 1745 - औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के प्रमुखण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, सी पी. डब्ल्यू. सी के प्रवक्ता से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, प्रवक्ता में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1745.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of C.P.W.D. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 64/84

In the matter of dispute between :

1. Shri Attar Khan
2. Shri Om Parkash
3. Shri Mahabir
4. Shri Chandra Singh
5. Shri Mahabir
6. Shri Bhagwan
7. Shri Gaddu Ram
8. Shri Bhawantipuram
9. Shri Nanuram
10. Shri Angnu Ram
11. Shri Bajnath
12. Shri Bajnath
13. Shri Ram Dass
14. Shri Ramesh
15. Shri Ram Sewak
16. Shri Ganesh Prasad
17. Shri Durga Prasad
18. Shri Mukandi
19. Shri Moolchand
20. Shri Sant Lal
21. Shri Puraan Gopal
22. Shri Sarju
23. Shri Suklal
24. Shri Suklal
25. Shri Chakki
26. Shri Durjlal
27. Shri Durjlal
28. Shri Rambahar
29. Shri Rumpadarnath
30. Shri Hira Lal
31. Shri Shiv Dayal
32. Shri Rajinder
33. Shri Bainilal
34. Shri Nathu
35. Shri Mahasingh
36. Shri Ramprasad
37. Shri Haryal Singh
38. Shri Bachanlal
39. Shri Kishori
40. Shri Dhani Ram
41. Shri Munni Lal
42. Shri Sona
43. Shri Pushpander Kumar
44. Shri Pati Rajram
45. Shri Ramnath Prasad
46. Shri Bal Chand
47. Shri Sardhari
48. Shri Mahesh
49. Shri Tejbir
50. Shri Murliprasad
51. Shri Sobraj
52. Shri Kishan Lal
53. Shri Kunjbihar
54. Shri Sarup Singh
55. Shri Santram
56. Shri Lalaram

57. Shri Bhari
58. Shri Ram Milan
59. Shri Gasita
60. Shri Ram Kumar
61. Shri Srikishan
62. Shri Lakshmunarain
63. Shri Moti Lal
64. Shri Raje
65. Shri Barai Singh
66. Shri Harbir
67. Shri Balvir
68. Shri Raghbir
69. Shri Rajvu
70. Shri Balkishan
71. Shri Ram Kishan
72. Shri Bhagwandas
73. Shri Kamtua
74. Shri Gopinath
75. Shri Ashra
76. Shri Ramoola
77. Shri Kishori
78. Shri Mohan Lal
79. Shri Janka
80. Shri Gubna
81. Shri Mannulal
82. Shri Pyare Lal
83. Shri Mula
84. Shri Arjun
85. Shri Ramavtar
86. Shri Kishanlal
87. Shri Apasram
88. Shri Ramtej
89. Shri Naubacha
90. Shri Napal Singh
91. Shri Ketha
92. Shri Desaiiah
93. Shri Nanu
94. Shri Kumeram
95. Shri Umiao
96. Shri Santram
97. Shri Punnalal
98. Shri Bhagwandin
99. Shri Kriparam
100. Shri Rohtas
101. Shri Ram Prasad
102. Shri Ajudi
103. Shri Barelal
104. Shri Pradipkumar
105. Shri Shiju
106. Shri Ata Mohd.
107. Shri Jaikishan
108. Shri Janqabahadur
109. Shri Kishori
110. Shri Shammurain
111. Shri Ramsurat
112. Shri Bilkaiah
113. Shri Pyarelal
114. Shri Kaviei
115. Shri Banneylal
116. Shri Baburam
117. Shri Satvir
118. Shri Arunkumar
119. Shri Manohan
120. Shri Brijpal
121. Shri Naram Singh

Versus

The Deputy Director (South) Horticulture, CPWD, I.P.  
Bhawan, New Delhi.

## APPEARANCES :

Shri H. S. Vats—for the workman,

Shri Narinder Chaudhary—for the Management.

## AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-42011(4)/84-D.II (B) dated 24th July, 1984 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of CPWD in terminating the services of 121 workmen (as per Annexure) on 30-6-82 and re-employing them on various dates without complying with the provisions of the I. D. Act, is justified? If not to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?"

2. The workmen through Secretary, CPWD Mazdoor Union Registered have filed a statement of claim in which it has been alleged that all the 121 workmen mentioned in the terms of reference were engaged on muster roll in unskilled category of Mali in the South Division Horticulture, CPWD in sub-Division IV and their services were illegally terminated on 30-6-82 without any notice charge sheet or enquiry and without payment of wages in lieu of notice or retrenchment compensation and persons junior to them were retained in service and thus there was violation of the provisions of Sections 25-F and 25-G of the I. D. Act. It was prayed that the workmen be reinstated in service with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement submitted that the workmen were engaged on muster roll basis for seasonal operation in unskilled category of mali and that the services of these workmen were not terminated but it is the workmen who did not report themselves for duty at their places of work and, therefore, the question of payment of wages in lieu of notice or any retrenchment compensation did not arise. There was no violation of seniority of these workmen as the question of seniority arises only when there is continuous period of working but in the present case the workmen themselves abandoned their service. It was further stated that out of 121 workmen 27 workmen have been absorbed on regular basis as work charge staff; 11 workmen have been found fit for absorption in the work charge establishment and may be appointed after familiarising them with the horticultural practices and 67 workmen are still working on muster roll. Only 16 workmen who did not report at the place of their working could not be adjusted as no work exists for them now.

4. A rejoinder was filed on behalf of the workmen in which re-employment of 105 workmen as mentioned in the written statement was not denied but it was re-asserted that the termination was illegal and it was denied that the workmen abandoned their services.

5. It may straightway be noted that the claim of the workmen that they had put in more than 240 days of work in the 12 calendar months preceding the date of termination 30-6-82 and thus had completed one year of continuous service as defined in section 25-F of the I. D. Act (hereinafter referred to as the Act) has not been denied by the Management. It is now settled law that the provisions of section 25-F are applicable as much to muster roll employees as to any other category of workmen who have completed one year of continuous service and their service cannot be terminated without complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the I. D. Act. If any authority is needed in this regard one may refer to Bhaskaran and others Vs. Sub-Divisional Officer and others FJR Vol 61 page 109 Kerala High Court.

"Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Sections 2(a) (g), (i), (n), (o), 9-A, 10, 22, 25-F, 25-G and 25-H—"Industry". Definited of—Includes Government Departments unless excluded by Law—posts and Telegraphs Department—In an "Industry"—Provisions of Chapter V-A of Act apply to workmen of the Department—Services of casual workers cannot be terminated without complying with section 25-F.

Sections 2(a), 2(g), 2(u), 2(s), 9-A, 10 and 22 and the proviso to section 17-A and the entries in the First Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, all indicate that the provisions of the Act will apply to Government activities also if such activities are of the nature to which the Act would otherwise apply. The postal, telegraph and telephone services are named public utility services and no such they are industries to which the provisions of sections 10, 12 and 22 of the Act directly apply. Therefore, it cannot be contended that the Posts and Telegraphs Department of the Government of India is not an "Industry" under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

If one is able to infer from the definition of "industry", read with the other provisions of the Act, that every organised activity carried on with the co-operation of employers and employees for production of goods or for rendering services is an industry, the yardstick has to be applied to Government activities also unless any exemption is recognised by the Act itself or other laws. That the State itself is not ready to make such exemption is indicated by the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1982, in which the definition of "industry" has been so amended as to exclude only governmental activities relating to sovereign functions, including departmental activities of the Central Government dealing with defence, research, atomic energy and space". The powers that be are apparently still unwilling to protect the posts and telegraphs Department from the invasion of industrial law.

Sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H appear in Chapter V-A of the Act and section 25-J provides that the provisions of this Chapter shall have effect notwithstanding anything in consistent therewith contained in any other law (including Standing Orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1947). Therefore, the provisions of sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H have an overriding effect and anything inconsistent contained in any other law, which must necessarily include Service Rules of Government employees, cannot be given effect to. They have simply to be ignored if the establishment is an "industry". If cannot, therefore, be contended that even if a department of the Government is an "industry" as defined in the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, its employees governed by Service Rules framed under article 309 of the Constitution stand outside the fold of the Act.

Therefore casual mazdoor employed by the Posts and Telegraphs Department are unskilled workers in an "industry" whose services cannot be terminated except in accordance with the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Orders of termination passed without regard to the said provision will have no effect."

The contention of the Management that the workmen had abandoned their services is not acceptable because within a short time of the date of termination the Management re-employed as many as 105 workmen out of 121 whose services are alleged to have been terminated and this goes to show that the workmen had made themselves available and they had no intention of abandoning their service. It was suggested to WW-4 Shri Radhey Sham appearing on behalf of the workmen in cross-examination that the workmen had assaulted one Randhir Singh S.O. and he had fallen down. This suggestion made by the Management is quite significant and goes to show that the services of these workmen were terminated for the alleged misconduct and it was not a case of abandonment. If the services of the workmen had to be terminated on disciplinary grounds, there should have been an enquiry to this effect. Therefore, it appears that in order to obviate an enquiry the Management has taken the stand that the workmen had absented themselves from duty. Even if it was assumed that the workmen had absented from duty, it would still mean retrenchment as was held in I. Robert D'Souza Vs. Executive Engineer Southern Railways and another 1982(44) F.L.R. 250 Supreme Court. It is not denied by the Management that no notice was served on the workmen nor any wages

in lieu of notice nor any retrenchment compensation was paid and in that event there was a clear violation of the provisions of section 25 of the Act and the termination of the services of the workmen must be held to be illegal and void ab initio.

6. Now the question arises as to what relief the workmen are entitled to. It is now a common ground between the parties that out of 121 workmen mentioned in the annexure to the reference 105 workmen have since been re-employed w.e.f. different dates. As there was no fault on the part of these workmen, it is directed that these 105 workmen shall be treated as continuous in service and paid full wages for the period between the date of their termination and the date of their re-employment. The case of the remaining 16 workmen falls in a different category. The stand taken by the Management is that these 16 workmen did not report for duty although the Management had offered to re-employ them and in fact had re-employed the other 105 workmen. There appears to be some substance in this contention of the Management. Since the Management had taken back into service other 105 workmen, there was no reason why the remaining 16 could not have been taken back in service if they had reported for duty. The Management has placed on record a list of these 16 workmen which for convenience of reference is marked as Ext. M-1. WW-1 Shri Om Parkash is one of the workmen and he has stated that after he was not given duty he has been selling vegetables and earning Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 daily. Similarly WW-2 Matasari another such workmen stated that after he was not given job he had been selling vegetables and earning Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 per day. Now if these 16 workmen were to be treated at par with the 105 workmen in the matter of back wages, it would amount to giving premium to these workmen who did not perform any duty in relation to the 105 workmen who have been putting in work after the date of re-employment. It is further noted that out of these 16 workmen two namely Shri Attar Khan and Apas Ram have since died. It is, therefore, directed that out of 16 workmen who were not re-employed, the 14 who are alive shall be re-instated with continuity of service but with only 50% of the back wages. As regards S/Shri Attar Khan and Apas Ram who have since died, back wages on the same pattern as the other 14 workmen shall be paid to their legal heirs. This reference is disposed of accordingly.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this may be forwarded to the Central Government for necessary action at their end.

Dated : 19th May, 1987.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-42011/4/84-D.II (B)]

का.प्रा 1716--औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 का (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय खाद्य निगम रायपुर के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर के पंचाट का प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8 जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1746.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India, Raipur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—  
CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(5)/85 U/S. 10 of I. D. Act

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India Raipur (MP) and their workman Shri Ram Raj Matasari, Assistant Gr. I, F.C.I.

through The Secretary, All India Trade Union of Food Corporation of India Employees and Workers, L.D.A. Building, Raipur (MP).

APPEARANCES :

For Workmen—None.

For Management—Shri R. K. Sharma.

INDUSTRY : Food

DISTRICT : Raipur (MP)

AWARD

Dated the 28th May 1987

This reference was made by the Central Government vide Notification No. L-42011(9)/83-D.IV (B)/D.V., dated 29-11-85 for adjudication of the following dispute :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Food Corporation of India, Raipur is justified in stopping Shri Ram Raj Matasari, Assistant Gr. I, F.C.I, Durg Depot, from work from 5-5-83 and again from 2-7-83 to 8-11-83 ? If not, to what relief the employee is entitled ?"

1. Parties were noticed to file their written statements but instead of filing the same they took seven opportunities for the purpose and again they sought adjournment to file settlement. But since the settlement could not be arrived at, they again took time to lead the evidence.

2. When the case was fixed for evidence on 19-3-87 Counsel for the management appeared on this date and filed a letter dated 2-3-87 signed by the Union Secretary informing this Court that the senior officers have promised the workman to consider his case, therefore he wants to withdraw this case. Thereafter, the Secretary was issued a registered notice to appear on 22-5-87 and verify the application, otherwise it will be presumed that the application is sent by him.

3. No one appeared on behalf of the workman or the union on 22-5-87 in spite of service of notice. Therefore it is presumed that the Union representative or workman has nothing to say against the letter dated 2-3-1987 filed by the management on 19-3-1987, meaning thereby that he does not wish to press this reference.

4. Reference is, therefore, accordingly answered that the Union/workman does not press the reference dated 29-11-1984 and I record my award accordingly.

5. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

[No. L-42011/9/83-D.IV (B)/D.II (B)]

का.प्रा 1747—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सी पी. डब्ल्यू. डी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट का प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10 जून 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1747.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of C.P.W.D. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 10th June 1987.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW  
DELHI

I.D. No. 63/84

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Raj Pal Singh Khalasi  
represented by CPWD Mazdoor Union,  
11/78, Moti Bagh, Village near  
Gurdwara Nanakpura,  
New Delhi.

Versus

The Executive Engineer (Elect.),  
Mech. & Workshop Division, CPWD,  
East Block IV, R. K. Puram,  
New Delhi-110066.

APPEARANCES :

Shri H. S. Vats for the workman.  
Shri Narinder Chaudhary for the Management.

#### AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-42012(4)/84-D, II(B) dated 21st July, 1984 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of CPWD in terminating the services of Shri Raj Pal Singh Khalasi w.e.f. 23-7-83 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The case of the workman as set forth in the statement of claim is that he worked in Mech. Workshop Division, CPWD from 18-5-82 to 23-7-83 (AN) as an unskilled labour and his services were wrongfully terminated without any notice charge sheet or enquiry. He was not paid any wages in lieu of notice nor any retrenchment compensation and persons junior to him were retained in service and consequently there was violation of Sections 25-F and 25-G of the I. D. Act. The workman prayed for his reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement submitted that the workman was employed on muster roll basis and the services performed by him were not regular and there were breaks, and that the workman abandoned his employment and there was not termination of his service and consequently question of service or notice or payment of wages in lieu of notice or retrenchment compensation did not arise. Similarly as the workman had not been removed from service, it could not be pleaded that persons junior to him were retained in service.

4. The short question that falls for determination in this case is as to whether the services of the workman were terminated or whether it is a case of abandonment of employment. The Management has placed on record a statement showing the working days of the claimant and while it proves that the workman had put in more than 240 days work during the 12 calendar months preceeding the alleged date of his termination, yet it discloses that the workman had been quite irregular in his attendance and the muster roll annexure 'B' to the written statement further shows that the workman was absent from 24-7-83 onwards. However, in spite of the fact that the workman had absented from his employment, yet the management indicated its willingness to take back the workman in service even now. In fact on 19-9-85 an agreement was entered into between the Management and the CPWD Mazdoor Union photostat copy of which is Ex. MW1/6. It goes to show that the Management had agreed to take back in service the workman and also to recommend condonation of the

intervening period to the Ministry and on the other hand the Union agreed not to claim wages for the intermittent period. However, the workman did not join duty in spite of this settlement. Although the Management wrote letter dated 19th April, 1986 photo copy Ex. MW1/2 to the workman and the letter of even date photo copy Ex. MW-13 to the General Secretary of the CPWD Mazdoor Union Ex. MW15 is the photo copy of the registered cover sent to the workman and Ex. MW1/4 is the report of the postal authorities. Again while the Management has examined MW1 Shri J. P. Maheshwari Assistant Engineer who has categorically stated that it is workman who had abandoned the employment and there was no termination of his service, the workman has not stepped into the witness box in spite of number of opportunities having been given. Taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances it appears to be a clear case of abandonment of service and not of termination and it is held accordingly. The workman is not entitled to any relief. This reference stands disposed of accordingly.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this award may be forwarded to the Central Govt. for necessary action at their and

19th May, 1987.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer  
[No. I-32012/4/84 D.II(B)]

का.धा. 1948—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय खाद्य निगम भटिन्डा के प्रबन्धन में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुवृत्त में निर्विष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8 जून, 1987 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 1748.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Chandigarh, as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India, Bhatinda and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI M. K. BANSAL PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D 99/1985

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India Punjab Region

AND

Their workman : Ram Singh.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri N. K. Zakhmi.

For the workman : Shri P. K. Singla.

INDUSTRY : FCI STATE : Punjab

#### AWARD

Dated, the 27th May, 1987

Vide Notification No. L-42012(5)/85 D. V dated 12.11.85 present reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was received from Central (Labour Ministry) which is as under :

"Whether the action of the management of Food Corporation of India in retrenching Shri Ram Singh, Casual Watchman with effect from 31-3-1982 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the worker entitled to and from what date?"



2. The case of the workman is that he remained employed in FCI under District Manager FCI Bhatinda from 1-4-1981 to 31-3-1982. That his services have been terminated without any notice or retrenchment compensation. So workman claim that he continued to be in service as his termination is illegal and void.

3. The management in their reply alleged that workman was engaged as casual watchman from the open market w.e.f. 1-4-1981, 30-9-81 and he was again engaged casual labourer from 1-10-81 to 15-10-1981 and from 2-11-81 to 30-11-1981 and was paid on rates approved by the D. C. Total period of work of workman is less than 240 days so no compensation was paid to him. It was also alleged that experience certificate issued by Shri Jaggi the then A.M. (OC) is not valid certificate as it has been issued without the approval of the competent authority that too at the time when the officer was under suspension.

4. Both the parties in support of their respective allegations produced oral as well as documentary evidence. The oral evidence consists of statement of worker wherein he corroborated his plea. He also examined P. K. Singla General Secretary of FCI Class IV employees Union who also proved his affidavit. In rebuttal is the oral statement of Baldev Singh who proved his affidavit M2. Besides the above documents were also placed.

5. The only point to be determine in the present case is as to for how much period the workman has worked. It is admitted that workman was employed initially on casual basis for a period of 6 months w.e.f. 1-4-1981 to 30-9-1981. The only dispute is whether workman was reemployed later on or not? Case of the management is that workman was employed for a short period after 30-9-1981. The management have not placed on the file the later of appointment issued by them. These wage even not shown to the workman during his cross-examination. To prove that he remained continued thereafter the workman placed on the file photostat copies from the attendance register. The photostat copy for the month of October 1981 shows that at No. 1 it has the signatures of Jiwan Kumar and presence of workman is marked in the end of for whole of October. Same is case with photostat copy for the month of Nov and December 1981. This shows that according to photostat copies which are with the workman he stands mark present up to the end of December 1981. Original attendance register have not been produced by the FCI to show that above copies are wrong and in the original attendance register the attendance of workman has not being marked. The FCI has not produced the register to show that Jiwan Kumar is not their workman. Due to above the document produced by workman will inspire confidence to show that workman continued in service up to the end of December 1981 which belies the contention of the management that services of workman were terminated in November 1981. The management has no doubt placed on the file photostat copies pertaining to the attendance of the workman alone but these copies can not be relied upon for the non production of the attendance register for the month of December 1981 and January 1982 onward.

6. In the present case the workman has also placed certificate issued to him by Shri Jaggi. This shows that workman has worked for one year. This certificate is not being relied upon by me as it was issued in August 1982. It is there on the file that Mr. Jaggi was suspended in July 1982. So this certificate can be procured by the workman.

7. Placing reliance on the photostat copies of the attendance register placed by the workman it is held that workman worked for more than 240 days with FCI during the year 1-4-1981 to 31-3-1982. It is admitted that his services were terminated without any payment of compensation i.e. in violation of the provisions contained in Section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. So order of termination is bad and effect will be that worker continue to be in service from 1-4-1981 onward.

8. Now question arises what should be done about the back wages. The workman vide his representative statement Shri P. K. Singla dated 26-5-87 has given up the claim for back wages.

9. So it is ordered that workman's order of termination is void. He is entitled to re-statement forthwith with continuity in service from 1-4-1981 up to date. As per statement of his representative his claim for back wages is disallowed. In a way reference is answered in favour of the workman.

Chandigarh

27-5-1987

M. K. BANSAL, Presiding Officer

[No. 1-42012/5/85 D.V./D. II(B)]

का आ 1719 --औद्योगिक विवाद प्रविर्तित, 1947 (1947 का 11) का धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रिय सरकार अधिनियमित सुप्रीमेट पाक फेडरेशन प्राथमिक कार्य श्रमिकों का प्रत्यक्ष ने समग्र नियोजकों और उनके कार्यकारी ने चिन्त, अनुक्रम में निम्नित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रिय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम अनुसरण के पत्रों का प्रकाशित करने है का निर्देश नगरों का 11 जून, 1987 का प्राप्त हुआ था।

SO 1749.--In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Assistant Superintendent of Post Office, North Rajkot and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th June, 1987.

BEFORE SHRI C. G. RATHOD, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
AT AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 15 of 1987

Asstt Superintendent of Post Offices, Rajkot.

AND

The Workmen employed under it.

Industrial dispute between the management of Asstt. Superintendent of Post Offices (North) S/Dn, Rajkot over re-instatement with back wages case of Shri D. B. Bhatt, Ex-Peon, Rajkot.

APPEARANCES:

Shri H. B. Chauhan—for the Asstt Superintendent of Post Offices, Rajkot.

Shri H. Dave—for the concerned workman.

STAFF: Gujarat. (Ahmedabad).

ORDER

The Ministry of Labour, Government of India, by its Order No. L-40012/49/85-D.II(B) dated 2nd February, 1987 has referred the dispute as regards the termination of services of Shri D. B. Bhatt by Asstt. Superintendent of Post Offices (North), Rajkot from 1st August, 1985 and to find out whether the said termination was justified and if not, what other relief the workman was entitled to, for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad, u/s. 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. By Ex. 11, Shri H. Dave on behalf of the concerned workman has stated that he does not want to proceed with the reference and that if it is disposed of accordingly. It appears that the concerned workman has written to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Vide Ex. 10 and copy of which was submitted to the Asstt Superintendent of Post Offices, North Sub-Division, Rajkot that he does not wish to proceed further with this case and as such it appears that there is no objection of permitting the concerned workman to withdraw the reference. In the circumstances, I pass the following order.

## ORDER

The concerned workman is permitted to withdraw the reference. No order as to costs.

C. G. RATHOD, Presiding Officer

(T. J. Dave)

Secretary

Ahmedabad, the 26th May, 1987.

[No. L-40012/49/85-D.II(B)]

HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1987

का आ 1750—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 1 जुलाई, 1987 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) और अध्याय 5 और 6 धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78,

79 और 81 को शिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबन्ध आंध्र प्रदेश राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :

“नेलोर जिले के नेलोर राजस्व भंडा में गुदिपाल्लिपाड राजस्व ग्राम के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र

[संख्या एस-38013/22/87-एस एस 1]

माना गुप्ता, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1987

S.O. 1750.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st July, 1987 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Andhra Pradesh namely—

“The area within the revenue village of Gudipallipadu under Nellore revenue mandal in Nellore District”

[No S-38013/22/87-SS 1]

MEENA GUPTA, Director